

ARTICLE XXXIV

*De Traditionibus Ecclesiasticis.*¹

Traditiones atque cæremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse ubique aut prorsus consimiles. Nam et variæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diversitate, modo nihil contra verbum Dei instituatur.

Traditiones et cæremonias ecclesiasticas quæ cum verbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt autoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis privato consilio volens et data opera publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiæ, qui quæ lædit auctoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quælibet ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi cæremonias aut ritus Ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

Of the traditions of the Church.

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that other may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

THE last paragraph of this Article ("Every particular or national Church," etc.) was added in 1563, as was also the single word "times" in the first sentence. With

¹ "Traditiones Ecclesiasticæ," 1553 and 1563.

these exceptions, it has remained unaltered since its first issue in 1553. Its language may be traced to a considerable extent to the fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, in which we find the following paragraphs:—

"Traditiones vero, et ritus, atque ceremoniæ, quæ vel ad decorem vel ordinem vel disciplinam Ecclesiæ ab hominibus sunt institutæ, non omnino necesse est ut eadem sint ubique aut prorsus similes. Hoc enim et variæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate, ubi decus, ordo, et utilitas Ecclesiæ videbuntur postulare:

"Hæ enim et variæ fuere, et variari possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate, ubi decus decensque ordo principibus rectoribusque regionum videbuntur postulare; ita tamen ut nihil varietur aut instituatur contra verbum Dei manifestum."¹

The clause added in 1563 seems to have been taken from a Latin series of twenty-four Articles, apparently drawn up by Parker in 1559; but "whether, from motives of prudence, or from inability to gain the sanction of the Crown,"² not circulated among the clergy. In this document we are told that "quævis ecclesia particularis auctoritatem instituendi, mutandi et abrogandi ceremonias et ritus ecclesiasticos habet, modo ad decorem, ordinem et ædificationem fiat."³

The main object of this Article is, as against the Romanists, to assert the right of the Church of England to make such changes as were carried out in her "traditions and ceremonies" in the sixteenth century; and a further object is to insist upon the duty of loyalty on the part of all members of the Church to those traditions

¹ See Hardwick, p. 264. We may be thankful that the characteristically Erastian reference to "princes and the rulers of countries" was not adopted in the Anglican formulary.

² Hardwick, p. 118.

³ See Strype, *Annals*, i. p. 216.

and ceremonies which were ordained and approved by common authority. This was rendered necessary, not only by the entire rejection of all authority by the Anabaptists, but by the way in which some among the English clergy, who were very far from sympathising doctrinally with these fanatics, were prepared to take the law into their own hands, and discard such ceremonies as they disapproved of.¹ These men were the ecclesiastical ancestors of the "Nonconformists" of Elizabeth's reign—men who would not secede, and who denounced the "separatists," but claimed to set at defiance the laws and regulations of the Church in which they ministered.²

There are three principal positions maintained in the Article—

1. There is no need for traditions and ceremonies to be everywhere alike.

2. Those persons are deserving of censure who break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which are ordained by common authority.

3. Every particular or national Church is competent to arrange her own ceremonies and rites.

Of these the first and third statements have been already considered in connection with Article XX., and it will be sufficient to refer the reader to what was there said. Nor does the second appear to require any lengthy proof. The position of the Church of England with regard to "ceremonies, why some be abolished and some

¹ Of these men Hooper was the leader. His objection to the Episcopal habit, and the difficulty about his consecration in consequence, is well known (see Dixon, vol. iii. p. 213 *seq.*); and it must be owned that considerable encouragement was given to this party by Ridley's utterly illegal onslaught upon "altars" in 1550. See Dixon, vol. iii. p. 200 *seq.*

² In the Lower House of Convocation a vigorous attempt was made in 1563 to have the terms of this Article softened in the interests of the Puritans, and the attempt only narrowly escaped being successful. See Strype, *Annals*, i. p. 335 *seq.*

retained," is clearly stated in the section with this heading at the beginning of the Book of Common Prayer (dating from 1549). In this we read that "although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing, yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God. *Let all things be done among you, saith Saint Paul, in a seemly and due order:* the appointment of the which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any publick or common order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorised thereunto."

It is obvious that unless such a position as this is conceded, nothing can result except confusion and disorder. No better example of this can be given than the extraordinary state of things which existed in Elizabeth's reign before the vigorous efforts of Parker, and subsequently of Whitgift, had succeeded in enforcing a certain degree of order and conformity to law.¹ Naturally this

¹ See the contemporary Paper prepared for Cecil in 1564, now among the Lansdowne MSS., vol. viii. art. 7: "Varietees in y^e service, and ye administracion used."

"*Service and Prayrs.*—Some say y^e service and pray^{rs} in y^e chauncell, others in y^e body of y^e church, some say y^e same in a seate made in y^e church; some in y^e Pulpitt, wth y^r faces to y^e people.

"Some kepe precyaly y^e order of y^e booke, oth^{rs} intermeddle Psal. in meter.

"Some say wth a surpluss, others w^{thout} a surplesse.

"*Table.*—The Table standeth in y^e body of y^e church in some places, in others hit standeth in y^e chauncell.

"In some places the Table standeth Alterlyke distant from y^e walle a yarde, in some others in y^e middest of y^e chauncell north and south.

"In some places the Table ys joyned, in others hit standeth uppon Trestells.

"In some y^e Table hath a carpett, in others hit hath none.

"*Administration of y^e Communion.*—Some wth surpluss and copes, some with surpluss alone, others with none.

Thirty-fourth Article was not much to the mind of the Nonconforming party, although they were able to evade its force, and to reconcile their conscience to the act of subscription to it by pleading that everything which they disliked was "repugnant to the word of God."¹

This is not the place to enter into the history of the controversy, which is really chiefly important because it was the occasion of Hooker's magnificent work. Nor does it appear necessary to say more here than to remind the reader of the four propositions which Hooker claims to have granted "concerning matters of outward form in the exercise of true religion."

"(1) In the external form of religion such things as are apparently or can be sufficiently proved, effectual and generally fit to set forward godliness, either as betokening the greatness of God, or as beseeing the dignity of religion, or as concurring with celestial impressions in the minds of men, may be reverently thought of; some few, rare, casual and tolerable, or otherwise curable, inconveniences notwithstanding.

"(2) In things the fitness whereof is not of itself apparent, nor easy to be made sufficiently manifest unto all, yet the judgment of antiquity concurring with that which is received may induce them to think it not unfit

"Some wth chalice, some wth a Co[m]munjion Cuppe, others wth a comof[n] Cuppe.

"Some wth unleavened Bread, some wth leavened.

"*Receaving*.—Some receave kneeling, others standing, others sytting.

"*Baptising*.—Some baptise in a fount, some in a Bason.

"Some signed wth y^e signe of y^e Crosse, others not signed.

"Some minister in a surpless, others without.

"*Apparell*.—Some with a square Cappe, some with a round Capp.

Some wth a Button Cappe, some wth a Hatte.

"Some in Schol^rs Clooke, some in others."

The document is printed in full in Parker's *Postscript to a Letter to Lord Selborne*, p. 148.

¹ See Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 110.

who are not able to allege any known weighty inconvenience which it hath, or to take any strong objection against it.

"(3) Where neither the evidence of any law Divine, nor the strength of any invincible argument otherwise found out by the light of reason, nor any notable public inconvenience, doth make against that which our own laws ecclesiastical have although but newly instituted for the ordering of these affairs, the very authority of the Church itself, at least in such cases, may give so much credit to her laws, as to make their sentence touching fitness and conveniency weightier than any bare and naked conceit to the contrary; especially in them who can owe no less than childlike obedience to her that hath more than motherly power.

"(4) In cases of necessity, or for common utility's sake, certain profitable ordinances some time may be released, rather than all men always be strictly bound to the general rigour thereof."¹

These propositions, Hooker fairly claims, are "such as no man of moderate judgment hath cause to think unjust or unreasonable"; and if they be admitted, they appear to be fully sufficient to establish the position taken up in the Article before us.

¹ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. c. vi.-ix.

ARTICLE XXXV

De Homiliis.

Tomus secundus Homiliarum, quarum singulos titulos huic Articulo subjunximus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et his temporibus necessariam, non minus quam prior Tomus Homiliarum quæ editæ sunt tempore Edwardi sexti. Itaque eas in ecclesiis per ministros diligenter et clare, ut a populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse judicamus.

Catalogus Homiliarum.

De recto ecclesiæ usu.
Adversus Idolatriæ pericula.
De reparandis ac purgandis ecclesiis.
De bonis operibus.
De jejuniis.
In gulæ atque ebrietatis vitia.
In nimis sumptuosis vestium apparatus.
De oratione sive precatione.
De loco et tempore orationi destinatis.
De publicis precibus ac Sacramentis, idiomate vulgari omnibusque noto, habendis.
De sacrosancta verbi divini auctoritate.
De eleemosina.
De Christi Nativitate.
De dominica passione.
De resurrectione Domini.

Of Homilies.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth: and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

1. Of the right use of the Church.
2. Against peril of Idolatry.
3. Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.
4. Of good works, first of fasting.
5. Against gluttony and drunkenness.
6. Against excess of apparel.
7. Of prayer.
8. Of the place and time of prayer.
9. That common prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.
10. Of the reverend estimation of God's word.
11. Of almsdoing.
12. Of the Nativity of Christ.
13. Of the Passion of Christ.
14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.

- | | |
|--|---|
| De digna corporis et sanguinis dominici in cena Domini participatione. | 15. Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. |
| De donis Spiritus Sancti. | 16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. |
| In diebus, qui vulgo Rogationum dicti sunt, concio. | 17. For the Rogation Days. |
| De matrimonii statu. | 18. Of the state of Matrimony. |
| De otio seu socordia. | 19. Of repentance. |
| De penitentia. | 20. Against idleness. |
| | 21. Against rebellion. |

SLIGHT verbal alterations of no importance were introduced into the English of this Article in 1571, when the mention of the twenty-first Homily "Against rebellion" (which had only just been issued), was added. But except for these the Article dates from 1563. The corresponding Article in the series of Edward's reign, of course, only referred to the *first* book, and without giving a list of them, merely stated that "The Homilies of late given, and set out by the King's authority, be godly and wholesome, containing doctrine to be received of all men, and therefore are to be read to the people diligently, distinctly, and plainly."

In considering this Article it will be well to consider separately—

1. The history of the Homilies.
2. The nature of the assent demanded to them.

I. The History of the Homilies.

The earliest mention of the Homilies is in 1542, when a certain number of them were introduced in Convocation with the design of having them promulgated and set forth by authority.¹ The design miscarried, and we hear nothing more of them until after the death of Henry VIII. But in the first year of Edward VI. the scheme was taken up again, and what is now known as

¹ Strype's *Cranmer*, bk. II. c. iii.

the first Book of the Homilies was printed and authorised by Royal authority, being ordered to be read in churches every Sunday after High Mass. The book contained twelve Homilies, with the following titles:—

- (1) A fruitful Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture.
- (2) Of the Misery of all Mankind.
- (3) Of the Salvation of all Mankind.
- (4) Of the True and Lively Faith.
- (5) Of Good Works.
- (6) Of Christian Love and Charity.
- (7) Against Swearing and Perjury.
- (8) Of the Declining from God.
- (9) An Exhortation against the Fear of Death.
- (10) An Exhortation to Obedience.
- (11) Against Whoredom and Adultery.
- (12) Against Strife and Contention.

The authorship of the whole number has not been ascertained, but probably the first, on the Reading of Holy Scripture, and certainly the third, fourth, and fifth, of Salvation, of Faith, and of Good Works, come from the pen of Cranmer. The sixth, on Charity, is by Bonner; the second, on the Misery of Mankind, by his chaplain, Hartsfield; and it is said that the eleventh is by Becon.

In 1549, in order to render them more acceptable to the people, they were subdivided into thirty-two parts, and the Prayer Book, which had just been published, directed that "after the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided." That the book was only intended as an instalment, is shown by the following note which stood at the close of it: "Hereafter shall follow Sermons of Fasting, Praying, Alms deeds; of the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our

Saviour Christ; of the due receiving of His blessed body and blood under the form of bread and wine; against Idleness, against Gluttony and Drunkenness, against Covetousness, against Envy, Ire, and Malice; with many other matters as well fruitful as necessary to the edifying of Christian people and the increase of godly living." Accordingly the rubric in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) said that "After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall follow one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by common authority." The death of the king, however, occurred before anything more was done. Shortly after the accession of Elizabeth the Book of the Homilies was reprinted (1560), and in 1563 a second book was added to it, presented to Convocation, and after some considerable delay authorised by the Sovereign.¹ Meanwhile, as we have seen, the Article was rewritten, and made to refer to the second book as well as the first. The direction in it, that **they are to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people**, should be noticed. It was rendered necessary by the dislike with which the Homilies were regarded by many of the clergy, who revenged themselves by reading them unintelligibly. The dislike was not confined to one party in the Church, for we find that in the "Admonition to Parliament" in 1571 one of the demands of the Puritans is this: "Remove *Homylies*, Articles, Injunctions."²

The second book, which contains twenty-one Homilies in forty-three parts, professes to supply "Homilies of such matters as were promised and entituled in the former part of Homilies"; but, as a matter of fact, those

¹ See Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 177.

² For the Puritan objections to the reading of Homilies in church, see Rogers *On the XXXIX. Articles*, p. 326 (Parker Society).

actually provided do not correspond exactly to the list of those promised at the close of the first book. Thus there are no Homilies expressly treating of Covetousness, Envy, Ire, and Malice; while there are several which were seemingly not contemplated when the first book was issued. The writer who is supposed to have had the chief hand in the preparation of the book is Bishop Jewel, but a considerable number of the Homilies were only translations or adaptations of works that had previously been issued. Thus those on the Passion and Resurrection are taken from Taverner's Postils, which had appeared so early as 1540. That on Matrimony is taken half from Veit Dietrick, of Nuremberg, half from S. Chrysostom; and two-thirds of the first part of that on Repentance are translated from Randolph Gualther. The Preface, or "Admonition to all ministers ecclesiastical," was from the pen of Bishop Cox. It should be added that the last Homily, viz. that against Disobedience and wilful Rebellion, was only added in 1571; the occasion which called it forth being the rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, which had taken place shortly before (1569), and to which the Homily itself clearly alludes.

II. *The Nature of the Assent demanded to the Homilies.*

The statement of the Article is that the Book of Homilies **doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times.** It is obvious from this that the assent demanded to them is of a very general character, and cannot be held to bind us to the acceptance of every statement made in them. Nothing whatever is said about the *historical* statements contained in them, some of which are highly questionable, or even demonstrably false. And as to the doctrine, all

that is asserted is that they "*contain a godly and wholesome doctrine.*" On one subject certainly their teaching appears to be invested with a peculiar authority, viz. that of justification, owing to the express reference to them in Article XI. But on other matters a wide discretion is left to the individual, and he cannot fairly be called upon to maintain any particular view simply because it is taught in the Homilies. The formal doctrinal teaching of the Church of England is found in the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer; and so far as the Homilies agree with these, and bring out the sense of their teaching, they are authoritative. But that is all. So much is confessed by all parties, and it has been frequently pointed out that it is impossible to tie persons down rigidly to the acceptance of every doctrinal proposition contained in these thirty-three sermons.¹ The matter is well put by Bishop Montague in his *Appello Cæsarem*, published in 1625—

"I willingly admit the *Homilies* as containing certain *godly and wholesome exhortations* to move the people to honour and worship Almighty God; but not as the *public dogmatical resolutions* confirmed of the Church of England. The XXXVth Article giveth them to contain *godly and wholesome Doctrine*, and *necessary for these times*: which they may do, though they have not *dogmatical positions*, or *doctrine* to be *propugned* and *subscribed* in all and every point, as the Books of *Articles* and of *Common Prayer* have. They may seem, secondly, to speak somewhat too hardly, and stretch some sayings beyond the use and practice of the Church of *England*, both then and now; and yet what they speak may receive a fair, or at least a tolerable construction and mitigation enough."²

Still more important, as being of the nature of a

¹ See especially *Tracts for the Times*, Nos. lxxxii. and xc.

² *Appello Cæsarem*, p. 260.

judicial decision upon this very point, is the statement of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust in his judgment in the Arches Court of Canterbury on Nov. 19, 1838. The question before him was whether the Church of England regarded praying for the dead as an illegal practice; and the authority of the Homilies had been quoted against it.¹ The judge entered fully into the matter, and decided that "it seemed clearly to have been the intention of the composer of the Homily to discourage the practice of praying for the dead; but it does not appear that in any part of the Homily he declares the practice to be an unlawful one." And then he adds the following important statement: "But supposing he had been of opinion that such prayers were unlawful, it is not to be necessarily inferred that the Church of England adopted every part of the doctrines contained in the Homilies."²

¹ See the third part of the *Homily* Concerning Prayer, p. 355 (S.P.C.K. ed.).

² The judgment is given in full in Lee's *Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed*, Appendix XII.

ARTICLE XXXVI

*De Episcoporum et Ministrorum
Consecratione.*

*Of consecration of Bishops and
ministers.*

Libellus de Consecratione Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum et de ordinatione Presbyterorum et Diaconorum editus nuper temporibus Edwardi sexti, et autoritate Parlamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad ejusmodi consecrationem et ordinationem necessaria continet, et nihil habet quod ex se sit aut superstitiosum aut impium. Itaque quicumque juxta ritus illius libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt ab anno secundo prædicti Regis Edwardi, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum juxta eosdem ritus consecrabuntur aut ordinabuntur rite, ordine, atque legitime, statuimus esse et fore consecratos et ordinatos.

The book of Consecration of Archbishops, and Bishops, and ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering: neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore, whosoever are consecrate or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforesaid King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

IN its present form this Article dates from 1563, when it was entirely rewritten. The corresponding Article in the Edwardian Series was of a much more general character, referring to the Book of Common Prayer as a whole, and not only to the Ordinal.

*Of the Book of Prayers and Ceremonies of the Church
of England.*

"The Book which of very late time was given to the Church of England by the King's authority and the

Parliament, containing the manner and form of praying, and ministering the sacraments in the Church of England, likewise also the book of Ordering Ministers of the Church, set forth by the foresaid authority, are godly, and in no point repugnant to the wholesome doctrine of the Gospel, but agreeable thereunto, furthering and beautifying the same not a little; and therefore of all faithful members of the Church of England, and chiefly of the ministers of the word, they ought to be received, and allowed with all readiness of mind, and thanksgiving, and to be commended to the people of God."¹

As originally drafted and signed by the royal chaplains, it had contained some words referring expressly to the *ceremonies* of the book as in no way repugnant to the liberty of the Gospel, but rather agreeable to it, and tending to promote it. To this serious objection was taken by John Knox, whose dislike of the ceremonies ordered in the book was perhaps not unnatural; and it is probable that it was in consequence of his remonstrances that all that part which referred especially to the ceremonies was omitted before publication.²

¹ "De libro precationum et cæremoniarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Liber qui nuperrime autoritate Regis et Parlamenti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ traditus est, continens modum et formam orandi, et sacramenta administrandi in Ecclesia Anglicana: Similiter et libellus eadem autoritate editus de ordinatione ministorum ecclesiæ, quoad doctrinæ veritatem, pii sunt, et salutari doctrinæ Evangelii in nullo repugnant sed congruunt, et eandem non parum promovent et illustrant, atque ideo ab omnibus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ fidelibus membris, et maxime a ministris verbi cum omni promptitudine animorum et gratiarum actione, recipiendi, approbandi, et populo Dei commendandi sunt."

² The clause in question appears in this form in the MS. signed by the royal chaplains: "*Et quoad cæremoniarum rationem salutari Evangelii libertati, si ex sua natura cæremoniæ illæ cõtinentur*, in nullo repugnant, sed *probe* congruunt, et eandem *in complurimis inprimis* promovent, atque ideo," etc. The words in italics were altogether omitted or modified in the published Article. For the part taken by Knox in securing the change, see p. 14, with the references there given.

As it now stands, the object of the Article is to assert emphatically the validity of Anglican Orders, and this against objections raised from two opposite quarters. On the one hand, the "Nonconformist" and Puritan party denounced the Ordinal as containing in it things that were of themselves **superstitious or ungodly**; on the other hand, the disaffected Romanists might deny that the form used could be said to **contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering**. And thus, as against both parties, it was deemed advisable to assert definitely that **whosoever are consecrate or ordered according to the rites of that book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered**.

The principal subjects, then, to be treated of here are these—

1. The objections of the Puritans.
2. The objections of the Romanists.

I. *The Objections of the Puritans.*

Since many of those who objected to the Ordinal, as containing that which was "superstitious and ungodly," objected not only to the special formula, "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc., used in conferring orders on the priesthood (which they denounced as "manifest blasphemy"), but also to Episcopacy itself, it seems desirable to consider here—

- (a) The question of the threefold ministry.
- (b) The formula of Ordination.

(a) *The question of the threefold ministry.*—The Preface to the "Form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons according

to the order of the Church of England" (1550), begins with the statement that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." The evidence for the existence of the threefold ministry, *from the second century onwards*, is so full and complete, that it is not likely to be questioned, and need not be summarised here. All that the opponents of Episcopacy can do is to endeavour to show that there are in later times a few possible exceptions to the rule,¹ and to deny that it is found in the New Testament, and can be traced back to "the Apostles' time." It will be well, therefore, to examine the evidence of the New Testament, and for this purpose it will be convenient to break up the Apostolic age into three distinct periods, each of which requires to be discussed separately.

(i.) The foundation of the Church. In this S. Peter is the most prominent figure, and the period is closed by his imprisonment and departure from Jerusalem in the year 44. Even at this early time we can discern the germs and beginnings of what afterwards grew into the threefold ministry. The Apostles are naturally the leaders and rulers of the Church, and at first its only ministers. But as the work grows under their hands some portion of it is delegated to the seven, who, though never called "deacons" in the Acts, are plainly the first representatives of that order, *selected* by the whole multitude of the faithful, but receiving their *appointments* from the Apostles (*οὓς καταστήσομεν*, "whom we may appoint," Acts vi. 3), and set apart for their office

¹ Of these the most important is the supposed exceptional constitution of the Alexandrian Church, on which see Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 134 *seq.*; and for supposed ordinations by presbyters in East and West, *ib.* p. 374.

with the imposition of hands and prayer (ver. 6).¹ Of the origin of what we term the *second* order of the ministry no account is given us, but by the end of this period we find it already in existence, for in Acts xi. 30 (just about the time of Peter's imprisonment or release) we read that the Christians at Antioch "determined to send relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa; which also they did, sending it to *the elders* (*πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους*) by the hand of Barnabas and Saul." This is the earliest mention of an order of ministers which we shall find appointed everywhere during the next period. Since its origin is nowhere related in the Acts (our sole authority for this period), it can only be a matter of conjecture. Possibly it was suggested to the Christian Church by the organisation of the Jewish communities, in which "the elders" occupied a recognised position.² However this may be, the fact remains that in this first period we find something fairly corresponding to our three orders of ministers, viz. Apostles, with the oversight of the whole Church, and,

¹ The reasons for maintaining that the appointment of the "seven" gives the origin of the diaconate are briefly these: (1) Although the title *διάκονος* does not occur, yet the corresponding verb and substantive (*διακονεῖν* and *διακονία*) are both used (vers. 1, 2). (2) The functions are substantially those exercised by the later deacons (cf. Lightfoot *On Philipp.* p. 186). (3) From the position of the narrative in the Acts and the emphasis laid on it by the writer, it is clear that he regarded it "not as an isolated incident, but as the establishment of a new order of things in the Church" (Lightfoot, *ubi supra*). (4) Tradition is practically unanimous as to the identity of the two offices, and that from the earliest times. See further, Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. 2), vol. i. p. 739.

² So Lightfoot *On Philipp.* p. 189, and cf. Gore, p. 399. But it is important to remember that, though the name was certainly borrowed from the synagogue, yet the functions of the Christian presbyters, as found in the writings of the New Testament and the earliest Fathers, mark out the office as really a new one of a spiritual character. For these functions see 1 Pet. v. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 2, v. 17; Titus i. 9; S. James v. 14; Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* xlv.

locally, elders and deacons. Indeed, we may go a step further, and maintain that something approaching to the local Episcopate already obtained in Jerusalem; for the message of S. Peter after his release from prison, when read in the light of later notices, is highly significant, "Tell these things unto James, and to the brethren" (Acts xii. 17). Why "unto *James*"? The only explanation is that he already occupied the position which we find him holding at a later period, of *president* of the local Church (see Acts xv. 13-21, xxi. 18; Gal. ii. 9, 12), or, as the tradition of the Church has ever regarded him, first bishop of Jerusalem.

(ii.) The second period is that of the organisation and extension of the Church. In it the prominent figure is the Apostle Paul, whose missionary labours formed the main instrument for planting the Church in various regions. The period is perhaps best closed, not by the Apostle's death, but by the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70. Our authorities for it are the narrative in Acts xiii.-xxviii. and the apostolic Epistles. In it we trace the extension of the different orders of ministers as new Churches are founded.

For the *diaconate* we have the evidence of the Epistle to the Philippians (A.D. 60), which shows us two orders of resident ministers existing at Philippi, *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι* (c. i. ver. 1). Still earlier (during S. Paul's second missionary journey), Rom. xvi. 1 shows us a woman deacon at Cenchreæ; and at a later period, after the Apostle's first imprisonment, 1 Tim. iii. 8 *seq.*, bears evidence of the extension of this order to the Church of Ephesus, though it is interesting to note that in the almost contemporary Epistle to Titus there is no mention of *διάκονοι*. It may, perhaps, be inferred from this that they were only appointed as the work grew, and the need for them was felt. In Ephesus, a Church which

had existed for some years (cf. Acts xx. 17), they were required. In the newly-founded Church in Crete the necessity for their help would not exist.

For the *second* order of the ministry as well the evidence during this period is full and complete. A representative passage is Acts xiv. 23: "When they had appointed for them elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed." This refers to S. Paul's first missionary journey, but it clearly indicates a custom which he followed everywhere. Only, having once stated it, S. Luke does not concern himself with recording it in other cases. In view, however, of such passages as Acts xv. 6 (Jerusalem), xx. 17 (Ephesus), Titus i. 5 (Crete), S. James v. 14, 1 Pet. v. 1, we are justified in assuming the existence of *πρεσβύτεροι* everywhere as a permanent feature of ecclesiastical organisation, and Acts xx. 17 compared with ver. 28 ("he called to him the *elders* of the Church" . . . "the flock in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *bishops*, *ἐπίσκοποι*), and Titus i. 5, 7 ("appoint *elders* in every city . . . if any man is blameless . . . for the *bishop*, *ἐπίσκοπος*, must be blameless"), enable us to identify the *πρεσβύτεροι* with the *ἐπίσκοποι*, whom we find mentioned, evidently as resident officers of the Church, in Phil. i. 1 and 1 Tim. iii. 1.¹

¹ There has recently been a tendency in some quarters to deny this identity, and maintain that the offices were distinct (So Réville, *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat*), but on quite insufficient grounds. It has not been thought necessary to enter into the questions which have been raised of late years with regard to the origin of the name *ἐπίσκοπος*, and the original character of the office, because throughout this work *the genuineness of the whole of the New Testament is assumed*, and if we admit as genuine the First Epistle of S. Peter, and the Pastoral Epistles, together with the discourse to the Ephesian elders in Acts xx., it appears to me simply impossible to deny that (whatever may have suggested the name, which is really of a very general and indefinite character) the office was

With regard to the *first* order of the ministry, it is evident that a general superintendence of the affairs of the Church was exercised by the Apostles themselves. S. Paul "went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the Churches" (Acts xv. 41). The "apostles and elders" were gathered together to consider the question of circumcision (Acts xv. 6). Letters of apostolic counsel and direction are written by them with superior authority, and by their hands ministers are set apart. But as the years passed Churches multiplied, and the original company of the Apostles became fewer in number, it became necessary to make provision for the future. Consequently, towards the close of this period we meet with men like Timothy and Titus exercising apostolic powers, commissioned to take the general oversight of Churches, to "set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint elders in every city" (Titus i. 5; cf. 1 Tim. i. 3). These men are plainly superior to the *ἐπίσκοποι* or *πρεσβύτεροι* over whom they exercise authority, and they are empowered to ordain others, whereas we never read of any such power being given to the elders.¹ But it would seem to be inaccurate to speak of Timothy and Titus as bishops of Ephesus and Crete, for in each case the Apostle directs them to return to him when they have accomplished the work for which he left them in these places (see 2 Tim. iv. 9; Titus iii. 12, with which cf. 2 Tim. iv. 10, which shows that after Titus rejoined a spiritual one from the first. The use of the name in 1 Pet. ii. 25, as applied to Christ, "the shepherd and *bishop* of your souls," is surely decisive as to this. On the theories in question reference may be made to Gore, as above.

¹ It is instructive to compare the address to the Ephesian elders in Acts xx. with the apostolic charges to Timothy in the two Epistles addressed to him. While to Timothy is given the power to ordain others, together with instructions concerning the qualifications of those on whom he shall "lay hands," there is no indication in the address to the elders that any such power had been intrusted to them.

the Apostle, instead of returning to Crete he was sent elsewhere, to Dalmatia). All that can be claimed for them is a "*moveable* Episcopate";¹ nor need we at this early period expect to find more. Time was required for the full ecclesiastical system to grow up into its present form; and the *diocesan system*, with its territorial bishops with definite regions assigned to each, was a later growth. In the period now under consideration we find no trace of it outside Jerusalem, where, as we have seen, it existed from the beginning. But the order of bishops as chief ministers of the Church may be distinctly traced to the Apostles. Men like Timothy and Titus form the link between the later regionary bishops and the Apostles themselves. It is probable also that with them we should include the "prophets" of the New Testament as exercising similar powers, for not only are they mentioned in various places as occupying positions of importance, and sometimes joined very closely with the Apostles (see Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 10; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11); but also in the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, while the *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι* are the two orders of resident ministers (exactly as in the New Testament), *ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται* appear as itinerant ministers, exercising a general superintendence, and superseding the local officers from time to time.

We may, then, sum up the results of our investigations so far. At the close of the second period two orders of resident ministers (*ἐπίσκοποι* or *πρεσβύτεροι* and *διάκονοι*) are found in fully organised Churches; and superior to them are Apostles and apostolic men, who visit their Churches from time to time, set in order things that are wanting, and appoint local officers as they are needed. But so far the precedent set at

¹ The phrase is due to Bishop Lightfoot.

Jerusalem has not been followed elsewhere, and beyond this Church the diocesan system is not yet in existence.

(iii.) The third period lasts from the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) to the close of the century and the death of the last surviving Apostle, S. John (A.D. 100). For this period our authorities are much less full than for the period immediately preceding it. But sufficient remains to enable us without any hesitation to assign to this time the change from the general to the local ministry, with the introduction of an approximation to the diocesan system, if not everywhere, at least in some of the Gentile Churches; and since the change falls in the lifetime of S. John, there can be no doubt that it was made under his guiding influence. The proof that the change was made during these years may be put in this way. We have seen that in A.D. 70 there was no such thing as the diocesan system except in Jerusalem. At the beginning of the second century we find from the Epistles of Ignatius that this system is *already in existence*, and firmly planted in the Churches to which he writes.¹ This necessarily throws back its origination to the first century, and to the period subsequent to the fall of Jerusalem in 70. There are other slight indications which confirm this, and show us the change in progress.²

¹ Nothing can be stronger than the language of Ignatius on the position of the bishop as superior to the presbyters, and the necessity of doing nothing without him. There is scarcely one of his Epistles in which this is not insisted on. See *Eph.* i. ii. iv.; *Magn.* ii. iii. iv. vi. vii. xiii.; *Trall.* i. ii. iii. vii.; *Philad.* i. iii. iv. vii. viii.; *Smyrn.* viii. ix.

² No reference is made in the text to the "angels" of the seven Churches of Asia (Rev. i.-iii.), because of the uncertainty which there is concerning the meaning of the term. If the *early* date of the Apocalypse be accepted, it is scarcely possible to identify the "angels" with the "bishops." If, however, the later date be adopted, the objection against the identification falls to the ground. Cf. Lightfoot *On Philippi*. p. 197.

(a) The *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων*, which has been previously referred to, may perhaps belong to the early part of this period.¹ As has been already mentioned, it bears witness to the existence of the earlier state of things with two orders of resident ministers, *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι*, and superior to them the *ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται*.²

(b) The Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians was written about the year 96. It contains an important passage on the Christian ministry, c. xl.-xliv. The passage requires to be quoted at some length. Clement starts by saying that "we ought to do all things in order, as many as the Master hath commanded us to perform at their appointed seasons. Now the offerings and ministrations He commanded to be performed with care, and not to be done rashly or in disorder, but at fixed times and seasons. And where and by whom He would have them performed He Himself fixed by His supreme will: that all things being done with piety according to His good pleasure, might be acceptable to His will. They, therefore, that make their offerings at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed: for while they follow the institutions of the Master they cannot go wrong. For unto the high priest his proper services have been assigned, and to the priests their proper office is appointed, and upon the Levites their proper ministrations are laid. The layman is bound by the layman's ordinance."³ It would be impossible to state the general principle of ecclesiastical order more strongly

¹ The exact date is quite uncertain, but it would probably be correct to place it sometime between 70 and 120.

² See c. xi. xiii. xv., and cf. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 276 *seq.*

³ C. xl. The translation is Bishop Lightfoot's, *Apost. Fathers*, Part I. vol. ii. p. 292. The original Greek may be seen on p. 121.

than is here done by Clement; and even if (with Bishop Lightfoot¹) we decline to press the analogy of the *threefold* ministry, yet still it remains true that a general comparison of the Christian ministry with that of the Jews is made, and that Clement regards the ministry as a necessary and Divine institution. Further, in the following passage, a portion of which has been already quoted under Article XXIII,² he proceeds to state with equal clearness the principle of the succession: "The Apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ. Both, therefore, came of the will of God in the appointed order. Having, therefore, received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So preaching everywhere in country and town, they appointed their first-fruits when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe.³ . . . And our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. For this cause, therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they provided a continuance,⁴ that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministrations. Those, therefore, who were appointed by them, or afterward by other men of repute with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered unblameably to the flock of Christ . . . these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 123.

³ C. xlii.

² See above, p. 578.

⁴ Ἐπιμονήν, see the note on p. 578.

from their ministrations. For it will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office unblameably and holily. Blessed are those presbyters who have gone before," etc.¹

These words need but little by way of comment, since they clearly insist on the importance of the succession with an appointment from the Apostles in the first instance, and afterwards from others *in accordance with their arrangement*. The only possible question is whether Clement recognises what is called monarchical episcopacy as existing at Corinth. His own position as "bishop" (in the modern sense) of the Church of Rome is thoroughly well established, but the passage just cited shows that ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι are with him still convertible terms, and there is no reference in his Epistle to any one person as ruling over the Church of Corinth above the presbyters. It is possible, then, that the local and diocesan system had not as yet been adopted at Corinth.² But on the principles of ecclesiastical order, and the need of a valid commission and succession, S. Clement's evidence is perfectly clear.

(c) To a later date belongs S. Clement of Alexandria's treatise, *Quis Dives Salvetur* (c. 180). But it may here be mentioned, because the narrative contained in it concerning S. John and the robber bears such manifest tokens of reflecting the genuine state of things in the apostolic days. In it ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος are still convertible terms; but the position of the bishop as presiding over the Church seems to be implied; and, moreover, the organisation of the Churches is expressly attributed to S. John, who is said to have come from Patmos to Ephesus, and to have gone also "when called, to the neighbouring regions of the Gentiles; in some to

¹ C. xlv.

² Cf. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 322.

appoint bishops, in some to institute entire new Churches, in others to appoint to the ministry some one of those indicated by the Holy Ghost." ¹ This exactly fits in with what we find elsewhere; and taken together we may say that the *Διδαχὴ*, the Epistle of S. Clement of Rome, and the narrative preserved by Clement of Alexandria, give us glimpses of the change that was passing over the system of the Church during the last quarter of the first century,—the change, that is, whereby the chief pastor became permanently resident as the highest officer in each Church, and the name of bishop or *ἐπίσκοπος* was attached exclusively to him. The Epistles of Ignatius, as referred to above, show us the change complete: and there is no necessity to pursue the history further here.

Against the view which has here been taken, that to the Apostles and their successors alone belonged the right of ordaining others, transmitted by them to the *ἐπίσκοποι* of the later Church, two passages of Scripture have sometimes been urged.²

(i.) The incident in Acts xiii. 1–3, where Paul and Barnabas are "separated for the work" by some who were not Apostles. The answer to this is twofold: *first*, it may be urged that if this is to be regarded as their actual ordination, it is still not an instance of *Presbyterian* any more than of *Episcopal* ordination; for if bishops are not mentioned, no more are presbyters. Those who are spoken of are called "prophets and teachers," and, as has already been shown, the position of the prophets seems

¹ Quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.* III. xxiii.

² It seems unnecessary to refer further to the view sometimes urged, that as *ἐπίσκοποι* and *πρεσβύτεροι* are convertible terms in the New Testament, their subsequent distinction is an invention of a later date, for the facts already summarised go to show that the "bishops" of the second century and later are the successors of the Apostles and of men like Timothy, rather than of the New Testament *ἐπίσκοποι*.

to correspond more nearly with that of the later bishops than with that of the second order of the ministry. But, *secondly*, it is very doubtful whether it was an ordination at all. Indeed, the arguments against regarding it as one seem overwhelming. To begin with, both Paul and Barnabas are included among the "prophets and teachers," and Barnabas actually heads the list. Therefore, whatever ministerial authority those who laid their hands on them possessed, Paul and Barnabas already possessed the same. Moreover, S. Paul always claimed that his apostolic commission came to him direct from Christ Himself, and "not from men, neither through men" (Gal. i. 1); and though on this view there is no actual mention of the ordination of S. Barnabas, yet it is worthy of note that on a previous occasion he appears as the delegate and representative of the Church of Jerusalem, invested with powers which it may fairly be said presuppose a formal commission from the Church (see Acts xi. 22, *ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν*). It appears, then, to be practically certain that the incident narrated in Acts xiii. was no ordination, but only a setting apart of the two Apostles to the Gentiles for their special work, done according to ancient custom, with prayer and imposition of hands.

(ii.) It is said that Timothy is spoken of as having been ordained "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14). Yes; but if the text is referred to, it will be seen that the expression employed is this, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy (*διὰ προφητείας*), with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (*μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*). It came to him, then, primarily *through* (*διὰ*) prophecy, and only with the accompaniment of (*μετά*) the laying on of the hands of the presbyters present: and "prophecy," it must be

repeated, is closely connected with the Apostolate; besides which, in 2 Tim. i. 6 S. Paul speaks of the gift as being in Timothy "through the laying on" of his own hands (*διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*). Clearly, therefore, he himself took the chief part in the ordination of his disciple, and the presbyters present were probably joined with him, as they are to this day when men are set apart for the priesthood.

We conclude, then, that the statement in the Preface to the Ordinal is strictly true, and that "from the Apostles' times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons"; and thus the "Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of Priests and Deacons," cannot be said to contain anything that is of itself superstitious or ungodly, because it recognises and retains the Episcopal order. Before passing on to the next objection, it may be well to add a few words concerning the mind of the Church of England on the *necessity* of Episcopacy. Certainly all that the actual terms of the Article now under consideration bind us to is this: that Episcopacy is not in itself superstitious or ungodly. This amounts to no more than saying that it is *an allowable form of Church government*, and leaves the question open whether it is the only one. This question is not decided for us elsewhere in the Articles; for even where we might have reasonably expected some light to be thrown upon it, we are met with a remarkable silence. Thus there is no mention of Episcopacy in the Article on the Church; and in that "De vocatione ministrorum," as was pointed out in the remarks upon it, there is a singular vagueness in the description of those who "have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." The Articles, then, leave us without any

real guidance on the question whether Episcopacy is to be regarded as *necessary*. Nor need we feel surprise at this, for at the time when they received their final form English Churchmen were standing on the defensive, and engaged in a severe struggle with a strong Presbyterian party, who objected to Episcopacy altogether. As against these men they were mainly concerned to defend the Episcopal form of Government as *allowable*, and with this they were content.¹ For the deliberate judgment of the Church of England we must look elsewhere. We find it in the Book of Common Prayer, which received its final form nearly a hundred years later than the Articles. The statements there made in the Preface to the Ordinal are conclusive as to the view taken by the Church. They may be summed up as follows:—

- (i.) The threefold ministry has been the rule of the Church from the Apostles' days; and no one has ever been allowed to exercise that ministry without a proper commission from lawful authority.
- (ii.) It is to be continued in the Church of England.
- (iii.) And therein no one is to be accounted a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, without Episcopal ordination.

The formal and deliberate assertion of this last fact dates from the final revision of 1662. The other two statements come down to us from the first Prayer Book

¹ It is possible to see indications of a change of view in Hooker. In book III., though he maintains that government by bishops "best agreeth with the Sacred Scripture" (xi. § 16), yet he does not press for it as necessary. In book VII. c. xiv., a much stronger position appears to be maintained by him. A strong position is also taken up in Bishop Bilson's *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, published in 1593; and Bishop Hall, in *Episcopacy by Divine Right* (1639), directly maintains that Episcopacy . . . is not only an holy and lawful, but a Divine institution, and therefore cannot be abdicated without a manifest violation of God's ordinance. *Works*, vol. ix. p. 160.

of Edward VI. (1549), and belong to a time when the question of Presbyterian orders had scarcely been seriously raised in this country. Had the question never been raised they might have been deemed sufficient. When, however, it had been raised, and attempts had been made by certain persons (as they were in Elizabeth's reign) to minister in the Church of England without an Episcopal commission, it was well that their right to do so should be more expressly denied, and this is what is done by the addition to the Preface of the words referred to above. Thus the Church of England, as judged by her formal documents, recognises none but Episcopal orders. But even so, it is interesting to notice how she treats the subject entirely from a practical point of view, pronouncing on it, not as an abstract theological question, but only as it concerns herself. She is not called upon to judge others. But her own position she is called upon to make clear: nor does she shrink from the responsibility. She sees that Episcopacy has been the Church's rule from the days of the Apostles. She in the providence of God has retained it, and it is her duty to hand it on without breach of continuity. It may be "charity to think well of our neighbours." It is certainly "good divinity to look well to ourselves";¹ and therefore she feels compelled to insist upon Episcopal ordination in every case, and can recognise no other.

(b) *The formula of Ordination.*—Besides objecting to Episcopacy in itself, the Puritans denounced as superstitious and ungodly the words used by the bishop in conferring the order of the priesthood: "Receive the Holy Ghost [for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of

¹ Archbishop Bramhall. So Thorndike "neither justifies nor condemns" the orders of the foreign Protestants. See Haddan's *Apostolical Succession*, p. 168 seq.

our hands].¹ Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The words appeared to them "ridiculous and blasphemous," and they maintained that the bishop might "as well say to the sea, when it rageth and swelleth, Peace, be quiet, as say, Receive," etc.² Their objections led Richard Hooker to consider the form very fully, and with his vindication of it we may well rest content. The main points in his defence of it are these: (1) The term "the Holy Ghost" is often used to signify the gifts of the Spirit as well as the Person of the Holy Ghost. (2) Authority and power for the ministry is a spiritual gift. (3) He, then, through whom the power is given may surely say, "Receive." (4) If our Lord, in ordaining, used the words (S. John xx. 22), why may not His ministers, seeing that the same power is now given? (5) The use of the words teaches and acts as a constant reminder that, "as disposers of God's mysteries, our words, judgments, acts, and deeds are not ours, but the Holy Ghost's."³

Of course, if it be held that no special spiritual power is given to Christ's ministers, and that they are not "sent" by Him, as He was "sent" by the Father, the words may well appear not only ridiculous, but blasphemous. But by those who hold that such powers have been granted for the benefit of the Church, and transmitted in the line of the regular ministry, no serious

¹ The words in brackets were only added in 1662. They were therefore, as a matter of fact, not before the Puritans of Elizabeth's reign.

² Admonition to Parliament, and "T.C." quoted in Hooker, bk. V. c. lxxvii. 5.

³ Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, bk. V. c. lxxvii.

difficulty can be raised concerning the use of this particular imperative form of words, although it cannot be considered as *essential*, since it is of comparatively late introduction into the Church, not being found in the older Pontificals and Ordination Services.¹

II. *The Objections of the Romanists.*

The Roman objections to the validity of Anglican orders have been singularly varied; those which at one time were most confidently relied on being at another quietly discarded in favour of fresh ones which a diligent search had been able to discover. They may be divided into two classes: (a) historical difficulties as to the succession; and (b) alleged insufficiency of the form, and lack of "intention." Apparently at the present time the tendency is to rely exclusively on the latter. But the former have been urged with such persistency that it is necessary to recapitulate them here, and give a brief outline of the answer returned to them.

(a) *Historical difficulties as to the succession.*—Shortly after the accession of Elizabeth, objections were taken by the Romanists to the *legal* status of the newly-consecrated bishops, partly in consequence of the fact that at Parker's consecration it had been found impossible to comply with the terms of an Act of Parliament of Henry VIII.'s reign, requiring a metropolitan to be consecrated by an archbishop and two bishops, or else by four bishops in the occupation of sees;² partly because the Act of Mary's reign which repealed the Prayer Book had mentioned

¹ See Martene, *De Antiquis Eccl. Ritibus*, vol. ii. p. 22; and cf. Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia*, vol. ii. p. 231 (ed. 2).

² 25 Henr. VIII. c. 20. See the account of Bonner's objections to Horn's jurisdiction in Strype, *Annals*, i. p. 377; and cf. Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 9.

the Ordinal separately, whereas Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which brought back the legal use of the Prayer Book, had not done so.¹ All such objections were, however, disposed of by Act of Parliament in 1566,²—an Act which is only referred to here because it has sometimes been alleged as if it involved a practical confession of the invalidity of our orders. More serious are the allegations subsequently raised, that the succession of bishops really failed at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign. Shortly after her accession no fewer than ten of the twenty-seven sees were vacant by death, including Canterbury, and as fifteen bishops had been deprived, it is natural that this should appear the weakest point in the chain of our succession. Accordingly Roman controversialists have strained their energies to the utmost to prove that the chain was broken, and that Parker, through whom the great majority of subsequent English bishops have derived their orders,³ was never validly consecrated. It is, however, a very remarkable fact that no such objection was ever heard of during his lifetime. The earliest rumour of it appears in 1604, forty-five years after Parker's consecration, and twenty-five after his death. In this year the notorious "Nag's Head fable" was set afloat by an exiled Roman priest named Holywood, who asserted that Parker had been "consecrated" by a mock ceremony at the Nag's Head tavern. The story is so palpably ridiculous, and its falsehood so glaring, that it is now almost universally discredited,⁴ and Romans themselves have been forced to

¹ Denny and Lacey, *ubi supra*.

² 8 Eliz. c. 1.

³ It must, however, be remembered that the Italian and Irish successions also met in Laud, and that, therefore, the validity of our orders is not really entirely dependent on the due consecration of Parker. See Denny and Lacey, p. 6, and Appendix I.

⁴ Denny and Lacey, however, give instances where the story has been treated as true by recent Roman Catholic controversialists, see p. 215.

admit that "it is so absurd on the face of it that it has led to the suspicion of Catholic theologians not being sincere in the objections they make to Anglican orders."¹ In refutation of it, it may be sufficient to point out the following facts:—

(1) According to the original author of the story, it merely rested on hearsay, for Holywood asserted in 1604 that he had *heard* it from one Neal, one of Bonner's chaplains, who had died in 1590.

(2) As Fuller quaintly puts it, "rich men do not steal." There was no possible reason for Parker to submit to such a ceremony. He was a man with a clear head, well aware of the difficulties of his position, and no possible motive can be suggested why he should have consented to be a party to such a transaction.

(3) There is abundant contemporary evidence of his consecration in due form in diocesan registers, in contemporary letters, in Machyn's Diary, in the diary of Parker himself, and in a MS. memorandum in the handwriting of his own son.

(4) The official records in the Registry of Canterbury, and MSS. given by Parker himself to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, attest his consecration in due form at Lambeth (December 17, 1559) by Barlow (previously Bishop of Bath and Wells, and at that time elect to Chichester), assisted by Scory (late of Chichester), Coverdale (late of Exeter), and Hodgkins (suffragan of Bedford).²

The lie, for it is nothing else, concerning the mock ceremony at the Nag's Head was nailed to the counter when it first appeared, and, finding that it was hopelessly

¹ Estcourt, *The Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed*, p. 154.

² For the full refutation of the story reference may be made to Lingard, vol. vi. note DD; Haddan's *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England*, p. 180 *seq.*; and Denny and Lacey, p. 211 *seq.*

discredited, Roman Catholic controversialists very soon changed their ground, and in 1616 impugned the validity of Parker's consecration by raising the question whether Barlow, the principal consecrator, had ever been himself consecrated. The facts with regard to Barlow are these. He was nominated first to the see of S. Asaph in Henry VIII.'s reign as early as 1536. In the same year to S. David's. In 1547 he was translated to Bath and Wells. In Mary's reign he was deprived, and at Elizabeth's accession appointed to Chichester. There are several documents which speak of his "election" and "confirmation." But the registers make no mention of his consecration; and consequently it has been asserted that Barlow, whose views of the Episcopal office were certainly somewhat lax, had never submitted to it, and therefore was never really a bishop at all. Now, it must be noticed that even if Barlow had never been really consecrated, it would not affect the validity of Parker's consecration, and therefore of orders derived through him, because we are expressly told that all the four bishops said the words of consecration and laid their hands on Parker's head.¹ But, as a matter of fact, there is really no sort of reason for questioning Barlow's due consecration. Once more a bare summary of the argument is all that can here be given.

(1) The registrar during Cranmer's Episcopate has omitted *eight* other consecrations (which have never been doubted) out of a total of forty-five; and the records of consecrations have been omitted or lost in other Archiepiscopates as well, in particular in Warham's just before, and Pole's just after Cranmer's. These facts show that the registers were very carelessly kept, and that therefore no stress can be laid on the absence of the registration in Barlow's case.

¹ Cf. Brightman in *Church Historical Society Lectures*, vol. i. p. 171.

(2) By law, consecration was to follow confirmation within twenty days, under penalty of *præmunire*. For what possible reason could Barlow have subjected himself to the risk of incurring such a penalty?

(3) There is abundant evidence that he was regarded as a bishop by his contemporaries; even Gardiner styles him "bishop," and his "brother of S. David's."

(4) He acted in various ways which of necessity presuppose consecration, *e.g.* he sat in the House of Lords and the Upper House of Convocation, assisted at the consecration of other bishops, and *administered his diocese for years without a single person demurring to his jurisdiction.*

(5) Not the smallest doubt was thrown upon his consecration until forty-eight years after his death (1616), when the Nag's Head fable had broken down.¹

These are the only instances in which it has been possible for the most vigilant eyes to detect any possibility of doubting the succession of Anglican orders; and the attack seems only to have brought out the strength of our case. In the latest Roman Catholic utterance this seems tacitly admitted, for all such objections, which for more than two centuries and a half had been so persistently urged, are quietly ignored. Not a word is said of them in the Papal Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ* (1896); and we may therefore hope that we have heard the last of them. There remains the second class of objections previously referred, on which the whole case against our orders appears to be based at present, *viz.*—

(b) Alleged insufficiency of form, and lack of "intention."

In regard to the "form" of ordination, the grounds of complaint have varied from time to time. At one time it was asserted that Anglican orders were invalid because

¹ See Denny and Lacey, p. 26 *seq.*

of the disuse of the ceremony of the *porrectio instrumentorum*, or delivery of the sacred vessels to all who are consecrated to the priesthood.¹ It is well known that Pope Eugenius IV., in his decree to the Armenians (1439), made the "form" of the Sacrament of Orders consist in this ceremony;² and if the Pope was right in this, there can be no question that not only Anglican orders are invalid, but also the orders of the whole Church, for it is absolutely certain that this ceremony did not exist till after many centuries of Christianity had elapsed. This is abundantly proved by Morinus, who shows that the ceremony is wanting in all the older ordination services of the Church;³ and consequently the objection at the present day takes a somewhat different shape. It is no longer said that the ceremony in itself is essential; but that the form is inadequate and insufficient because everything which implies the *sacerdotium*, and the power of offering sacrifice, has been eliminated from the rite. The special omissions which are said to establish this are two. *Firstly*, from 1550 up to the last revision of the Ordinal in 1662 there was no special mention in the formula of Ordination of the office for which the aid of the Holy Ghost was sought. The form was simply this: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive," etc.; and for the consecration of a bishop: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by

¹ In the first reformed English Ordinal the ceremony was retained, though the words referring to the power of sacrificing were omitted. "The bishop shall deliver to every one of them the Bible in the one hand, and the chalice or cup with the bread in the other hand, and say: Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacrament in this congregation." The words placed in italics were, however, entirely omitted in 1552.

² Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. ix. p. 434.

³ Morinus, *De Ordinatione*. Pars III. exercit. vii.; cf. Denny and Lacey, p. 107.

imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love, and of soberness." Not till 1662 were the words "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands," and the corresponding words in the consecration of a bishop, "for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee," etc., inserted. *Secondly*, when the English Ordinal was put forth in 1550, the words which definitely speak of the power of sacrificing were dropped: "Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis." It is said that these omissions involve an entire change in the whole conception of orders, and thus invalidate the form. In answer to this, it may be pointed out that the words omitted are confessedly of late introduction, and therefore cannot be regarded as essential.¹ What was done in 1550 was to *revert to a scriptural formula in each case*, and to say that to do this invalidates the form is to prove too much. In the case of priests, the form used is the very one used by our Lord Himself, and therefore must be sufficient to confer whatever powers were conferred by it in the first instance; and we ask to confer no more. In the case of bishops, the words of S. Paul referring to the consecration of Timothy (2 Tim. i. 7) are employed, and the whole context makes it perfectly clear that it is for the office and work of a bishop that the gift of the Holy Ghost is sought. Moreover, in this case the corresponding form in the Latin Pontifical is equally indeterminate, as there, too, there is no specific mention of the office and work of a bishop. Further, with regard to the omission of the words which confer the power of sacrificing, it must be remembered that the formula of ordination as used in the Church of England includes,

¹ See further, Denny and Lacey, p. 72 *seq.*

and has always included, a commission to minister the sacraments; and this must necessarily include a commission to "offer" the Eucharistic sacrifice, in whatever sense the Eucharist be a sacrifice. It has been truly said that "the sacrifice of the Eucharist is not something superadded to the sacrament. It cannot be more than is included in 'Do this in remembrance of me.' Whatever it is or is not, it cannot be more than is covered by 'the perpetual memory of that His precious death until His coming again.' In conferring the authority to celebrate the Eucharist, the Church cannot help conferring the power of sacrifice, even if she would."¹ But, as was shown under Article XXXI., there is not the slightest ground for thinking that the Church of England ever wished to deny the Eucharistic sacrifice when rightly understood. "The Sacrifices of Masses," as often taught in the sixteenth century, she was rightly concerned to deny. And in her desire to repudiate what was false and heretical, it may be that she went further than was necessary in omitting reference to the Eucharistic sacrifice. But this is the utmost that can be fairly said; and it is a simple matter of fact that the commission to offer the Eucharist must be included in the "authority . . . to minister the holy sacraments in the congregation," which is given to every Anglican priest at the time of his ordination.

There remains the objection that our orders are invalid through lack of "intention." It has been said that "the Church does not judge about the mind and intention in so far as it is by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally, she is bound to judge concerning it. When any one has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting or conferring the sacrament, he is considered by the

¹ Brightman in *Church Historical Society Lectures*, vol. i. p. 189.

very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed."¹ This utterance of the highest authority in the Roman Church relieves us from the necessity of considering the private opinions of Barlow or Cranmer, or any others. If the due form be rightly and seriously made use of, that is all that is required. A parody or unseemly jest would not be a valid sacrament, even if the proper matter and form of words were used, because the lack of intention would be "externally manifest"; but where the ceremony is performed *as a Church ceremony*, there the intention of the Church is present, even if the minister be himself heretical. As Hooker puts it: "Inasmuch as sacraments are actions religious and mystical, which nature they have not unless they proceed from a serious meaning, and what every man's private mind is, as we cannot know, so neither are we bound to examine; therefore in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice, and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume that he which outwardly doth the work hath inwardly the purpose of the Church of God."²

That then with which we are concerned is not the "private mind" of any of the Reformers, but the form of the rite as expressing the mind of the Church of England; and if it could be proved that the rite was changed "with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church, and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the sacrament,"³ then

¹ The Papal Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*.

² Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. V. c. lviii. 3.

³ The Papal Bull, *Apostolicæ Curæ*.

indeed, it might be fairly held that defect of intention was established. But, as a matter of fact, the Church of England has been particularly careful to express her intention, and to make it perfectly clear that it was no new rite which she introduced in the sixteenth century, but that *her intention was to continue the ancient orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, which had come to her from the days of the Apostles themselves*. In witness to this, appeal may be made to the Preface, which since 1550 has stood in the forefront of the Ordinal.¹ It is there stated that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture, and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons, which offices were evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man by his own private authority might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereunto. And therefore, *to the intent these orders should be continued*, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, it is requisite that no man (not being at this present bishop, priest, nor deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following." It is hard to conceive what more could be asked for, since it would be difficult to frame words which should express with greater clearness that the intention of the Church was not to make a new ministry, but to continue that which already existed. But if further proof of the mind of the Church be demanded, it may be found not only in the form of

¹ A few verbal changes were introduced in 1662, as may be seen by comparing the Preface as it stands in a modern Prayer Book with the form here given in the text.

service used which throughout speaks of "priests" and "bishops," but also in the fact that the Church of England recognises the priesthood of the Church of Rome; and while she takes the utmost care to guard her altars from unauthorised ministrations, yet whenever a Roman priest joins the Anglican Communion, he is recognised as a priest at once, and is in virtue of his ordination in the Church of Rome admitted to celebrate the sacraments. This could not be, unless the office were intended to be the same as that which he had already received. We conclude, then, that the objection on the score of *defect of intention* fails, as the other objections previously enumerated have failed; and that there is nothing to make us feel a shadow of doubt as to the validity of our orders, or as to the statement of the Article, that **the Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of priests and deacons . . . doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering . . . and therefore whosoever are consecrate or ordered according to the rites of that book . . . all such [are] rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.**¹

¹ It has been impossible in the space available to give more than the briefest outline of the objections that have been raised against the validity of Anglican Orders, and of the answers returned to them. Fuller information must be sought in some of the many excellent treatises which exist upon the subject. Among older books, A. W. Haddan's *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England* may be mentioned; and reference should also be made to Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, which brings the subject fully up to date, and considers the objections in the latest form in which they have been presented. See also *The Bull Apostolicæ Curæ and the Edwardine Ordinal*, by F. W. Puller; and for the practice of the Roman Church as to the reordination in Mary's reign of those who had been ordained according to the Edwardian Ordinal, see W. H. Frere, *The Marian Reaction in its relation to the English Clergy*. See also Moberly's *Ministerial Priesthood*, an important work which has appeared since the above note was written.

ARTICLE XXXVII

De civilibus Magistratibus.

Regia Majestas in hoc Angliæ Regno ac cæteris ejus Dominiis, summam habet potestatem, ad quam omnium statuum hujus Regni sive illi ecclesiastici sunt sive non, in omnibus causis suprema gubernatio pertinet, et nulli externæ jurisdictioni est subjecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiæ Majestati summam gubernationem tribuimus, quibus titulis intelligimus animos quorundam calumniatorum offendi: non damus Regibus nostris aut verbi Dei aut sacramentorum administrationem, quod etiam Injunctiones ab Elizabetha Regina nostra nuper æditæ, apertissime testantur: sed eam tantum prærogativam, quam in sacris Scripturis a Deo ipso omnibus piis Principibus, videmus semper fuisse attributam, hoc est, ut omnes status atque ordines fidei suæ a Deo commissos, sive illi ecclesiastici sint, sive civiles, in officio contineant, et contumaces ac delinquentes, gladio civili coerceant.

Romanus Pontifex nullam habet jurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliæ.

Leges Civiles possunt Christianos propter capitalia et gravia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet et ex mandato

Of the Civil Magistrates.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen, doth most plainly testify: But that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The laws of the Realm may

Magistratus arma portare et justa¹
bella administrare.

punish Christian men with death,
for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at
the commandment of the Magis-
trate, to wear weapons, and serve in
the wars.

VERY important alterations were made in this Article in 1563, when the first paragraph was entirely rewritten, and the second, referring to Elizabeth's Injunctions, introduced for the first time. Instead of the very careful and guarded statement of the Royal supremacy now contained in these two paragraphs, the Edwardian Article had bluntly stated that "the King of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland." It also contained a clause (omitted in 1563) after that referring to the Bishop of Rome, stating in Scriptural language that "the civil magistrate is ordained and allowed of God: wherefore we must obey him, not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience' sake" (cf. Rom. xiii. 1, 5).

The object of the Article is (1) to explain and justify the tenet of the Royal supremacy, (2) to assert formally the repudiation of the jurisdiction of the Pope, and (3) to condemn the attitude of the Anabaptists with regard to the obedience due to the magistrate, and the lawfulness of capital punishment and of serving in war. With regard to this last point it may be noted that so formidable was the spread of the Anabaptists, that they were expressly excluded from the pardon granted by Henry VIII. in 1540; and among their errors the following are particularly mentioned: "That it is not lawful for a Christian man to bear office or rule in the Common-

¹ It is not easy to say why there is nothing corresponding to this word in the English. In the series of 1553 "justa bella" was represented by "lawful wars."

wealth,"¹ and "that no man's laws ought to be obeyed."²

The subjects brought before us in this Article may best be treated of under the following heads:—

1. The Royal supremacy.
2. The Papal claims.
3. The lawfulness of capital punishment.
4. The lawfulness of war.

I. *The Royal Supremacy.*

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

¹ Cf. the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, *De Hæres.* c. 18.

² 32 Henr. VIII. c. 49, § 11. See Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. iii. p. 843, and cf. the Confession of Augsburg, Art. XVI.: "*De rebus civilibus.* De rebus civilibus docent, quod legitimæ ordinationes civiles sint bona opera Dei, quod Christianis liceat gerere magistratus, exercere judicia, judicare res ex imperatoriis, et aliis præsentibus legibus, supplicia jure constituere, jure bellare, militare, lege contrahere, tenere proprium, jusjurandum postulantibus magistratibus dare, ducere uxorem, nubere. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui interdiciunt hæc civilia officia Christianis," etc. To the same effect, the twelfth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538: "Licet insuper Christianis universis ut singuli quique pro suo gradu ac conditione juxta divinas ac principum leges et honestas singularum regionum consuetudines, talia munia atque officia obeant et exerceant, quibus mortalis hæc vita vel indiget, vel ornatur, vel conservatur. Nempe ut victum quærant ex honestis artibus, negocientur, faciant contractus, possideant proprium, res suas jure postulent, militent, copulentur legitimo matrimonio, præsent jusjurandum et hujusmodi"; and in Hermann's Consultation, among the errors of the Anabaptists the following is noted: "That to administre the cōmon weale, to exercise cōmon iugementes, to punishe yll doers, be offices and workes contrarie to the preceptes of Christe, whiche a Christian man ought not to do."—English translation (1548), fol. cxl.

In considering the history of the formal assertion of the Royal supremacy, it will be well to mark out clearly two stages—(a) the recognition of the Sovereign as “Supreme Head,” and (b) his recognition as “Supreme Governor.”

(a) The formal recognition of the Sovereign as “Supreme Head” begins in the year 1531. In this year Henry VIII., who was now bent upon obtaining his divorce, with a view to obtaining the ready submission of the clergy when the question should be brought before them, insisted on the introduction of a new form of the king’s title into the preamble of an Act of Convocation by which a grant of money was to be made to the Crown. As originally presented to the Convocation, the form of the title spoke of “the English Church and clergy, of which the king alone is protector and supreme head.” It was, however, only accepted by the clergy with the qualifying clause, “as far as the law of Christ permits.”¹

The following year was marked by the “submission of the clergy,” whereby the Convocation formally acknowledged that the Royal licence was necessary for Convocation to meet, and to make Canons, and also agreed that the existing Canon Law should be reviewed by a Commission appointed by the Crown.²

Meanwhile Parliament had begun to pass a series of

¹ “Ecclesie, et cleri Anglicani, cujus singularem protectorem unicum et supremum dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem recognoscimus.” For the history of this see Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, vol. i. p. 62 seq. The text of this and the other formal Acts by which the Royal supremacy was recognised are conveniently collected together in the *Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, vol. i. p. 70.

² Dixon, vol. i. p. 110, *Eccl. Courts Commission*, p. 71. It was this agreement that the Canon Law should be reviewed which led to the appointment of the various Commissions from which the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* emanated. As, however, was mentioned on p. 23, it never received any authority whatever.

Acts to restrain the Papal jurisdiction in this country, such as the Act for restraint of Appeals (1533), and thus to secure the supremacy of the Crown over all persons and causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil; and in 1534, not only was the submission of the clergy embodied in an Act of Parliament,¹ but an Act was passed asserting the supreme headship of the Crown, and defining its character.²

In this it was stated that, “albeit the king’s majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognised by the clergy of this realm in their Convocations, yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ’s religion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirpate errors, heresies, and other enormities, and abuses heretofore used in the same: be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken accepted and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm as well the title and stile thereof as all honours, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church belonging and appertaining; and that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they may be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought or may lawfully be reformed,

¹ 25 Henr. VIII. c. 19.

² 26 Henr. VIII. c. 1. See *Eccl. Courts Commission*, p. 72.

repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm, any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding."

The title "supreme head" was thus formally taken by Henry VIII. Its use was continued by Edward VI, and (at her accession) by Mary, who used it in the early proclamations of her reign.¹ She, however, is the last English sovereign who has ever claimed it. It was dropped by her on her marriage with Philip of Spain in 1554. The "Supreme Head Act," cited above, was legally repealed, *and has never been re-enacted*. But for twenty years, from 1534 to 1554, the "supreme headship" was a tremendous reality. It "involved a claim on the part of the Crown to exercise spiritual jurisdiction,² and not merely to see that the spiritual authorities exercised their jurisdiction, and was a wholly new and unprecedented claim." "For twenty years the independent jurisdiction of the Church, exercised by her own officers—the ordinaries—and in her own courts according to her own law, was superseded by the authority of the Crown, and the ordinaries became only the officers of the Government, in virtue of the powers said to be vested in the Crown by the recognition of its supreme headship."³

¹ Jewel makes good use of this fact as against the Romanists more than once. See his *Works* (Parker Society ed.), vol. i. p. 61, and iv. p. 974.

² Henry VIII. actually claimed to delegate the exercise of this spiritual jurisdiction to whomsoever he would, and in 1535 appointed Thomas Cromwell to be his vicegerent in ecclesiastical matters.

³ Wakeman, *Introduction to the History of the Church of England*, pp. 318, 320, where there is an admirable sketch of the whole subject.

The Church, it must be admitted, after her first protest, acquiesced in and submitted to this tyranny, and during this period many utterly irregular and unconstitutional things were done. Happily the period of the supreme headship was of no long duration, and there is no need to enter further into the history of it here.

(b) On the accession of Elizabeth in 1558, Mary's Act abolishing the old Act of Supremacy remained unrepealed; but a new Act was passed, claiming for the Crown the title of "supreme governor" instead of "supreme head."¹ And although the Act of Parliament conceded to the Crown large powers, and claimed for it, as Henry's Act did, spiritual jurisdiction, yet, when some of the clergy scrupled to take the oath enjoined by the Act, the sovereign put forth an explanation of it in "an Admonition to simple men deceived by malicious," which was appended to the Injunctions of 1559. This explanation is not altogether consistent with itself, for it claims the authority challenged and used by Henry VIII., but then proceeds at once to define and very materially limit its meaning, describing it as "of ancient time due to the Imperial Crown of this realm, that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them." And it is added that "if any person, that hath conceived any other sense of the form of the said oath, shall accept the same oath with this interpretation, sense, or meaning; Her Majesty is well pleased to accept every such in that behalf as her good and obedient subjects, and shall acquit them of all manner of penalties contained in the

¹ Eliz. c. 1. See *Ecol. Courts Commission*, p. 73.

said Act against such as shall peremptorily or obstinately refuse to take the same oath."¹

The explanation thus given is of the utmost importance. It forms an authoritative commentary upon and interpretation of the Act of Parliament, and, taken in connection with the alteration of style and the adoption of the title of "supreme governor" in place of that of "supreme head,"² it indicates a real and substantial change in the conception of the Royal supremacy. It reduces it within reasonable limits, and gives it a far more constitutional character, and one more in accordance with ancient precedents, than could be claimed for the form it had assumed under Henry VIII. Further, it should be noted that Elizabeth's acts entirely bore out the interpretation which she gave in her Injunctions. Her *government* of the Church was a very real thing, but she was most careful to maintain that it is "the Church," and not the Crown, which "hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and hath authority in controversies of faith;" and the powers which she claimed and exercised were visitorial and corrective, a right of supervision rather than of ordinary administration such as Henry VIII. and Edward VI. with his Council had exercised. It is, then, in this limited and qualified sense that the Royal supremacy was accepted by the Church at the accession of Elizabeth, and all subsequent documents that can claim to speak with any authority whatever upon the subject concur in regarding it in this light. Ignorant people have often spoken of the sovereign as "head" of the Church, but entirely without warrant.

¹ See Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 232.

² "The Queen is unwilling to be addressed, either by word of mouth or in writing, as the head of the Church of England. For she seriously maintains that this honour is due to Christ alone, and cannot belong to any human being soever."—Jewel to Bullinger, *Zurich Letters*, vol. i. p. 33.

"Concerning the title of 'supreme head of the Church, we need not to search for Scripture to excuse it. For, first, we devised it not; secondly, we use it not; thirdly, our princes at this present claim it not." So wrote Jewel in 1567,¹ and his words remain true still. The interpretation given in the Injunctions was expressly referred to in the Articles of 1563, so that, after claiming for the sovereign the chief *government* of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, the Article proceeds to explain with great care in what this consists.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended: we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's word or of sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth most plainly testify: But that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

To the same effect in the proclamation issued on the occasion of the northern rebellion in 1569, Elizabeth expressly declared that she pretended "no right to define Articles of faith, to change ancient ceremonies formerly adopted by the Catholic and Apostolic Church, or to minister the word or the sacraments of God; but that she conceived it her duty to take care that all estates under her rule should live in the faith and obedience

¹ *Defence of the Apology, Works*, vol. iv. p. 974.

of the Christian religion; to see all laws ordained for that end duly observed; and to provide that the Church be governed and taught by archbishops, bishops, and ministers."¹

Once more, in the "Royal Declaration" prefixed to the Articles in 1628, the sovereign is made to say that—

"Being at God's ordinance, according to our just title, *Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church, within these our Dominions*, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge in unity of true religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary disputations, altercations, or questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth. We have therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this declaration following:

"That we are Supreme Governor of the Church of England: and that if any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the *Injunctions, Canons*, and other *Constitutions* whatsoever thereto belonging, the clergy in their Convocations is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under our broad seal so to do: and we approving their said ordinances and constitutions, providing that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land."

These documents are all-important ones, as showing how the supremacy was explained to and accepted by the Church. Something more, however, may here be added in justification of it.

The Article claims that it is only the "prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly

¹ Quoted in Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. vi. p. 55.

princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself." This is the view of it which was strongly pressed in the sixteenth century, when an appeal was frequently made to the position occupied by the head of the State in the system of the Jews under the Old Covenant. So Jewel writes that "Queen Elizabeth doth as did Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Josias, Jehoshaphat."¹ But the position of the Jewish Commonwealth was so peculiar that it may be doubted whether the appeal was altogether a fair one, or whether the position of the sovereign is perfectly analogous to that occupied by the Hebrew monarchs. It is better to refer rather to those passages of the New Testament which support the claims of established authority to loyal obedience, as Rom. xiii. and 1 Pet. ii. 13–17. The Church, it must be remembered, exists as a spiritual society under the conditions of civil life. Its members must therefore be subject to the law of the State as to conduct and the enjoyment of the civil rights. Thus in very early days appeals were made even to heathen emperors by the Church where cases of property and civil rights were concerned.² And if Cranmer was right in asserting that no more is given to the sovereign by the assertion of the Royal supremacy than was conceded to Nero, who was "head" of the Church in S. Paul's day, or might be conceded to the Grand Turk, who in the same way is "head" of the Church in his dominions,³ certainly

¹ Jewel, *Works*, vol. iv. p. 1145.

² *E.g.* in the case of Paul of Samosata, who refused to give up the bishop's house after his deposition by the Council of Antioch in 269. After the defeat of Zenobia, the aid of Aurelian was invoked to give effect to the sentence of the Synod, and in 272, by the help of the civil power, Paul was ejected. See Eusebius, *H. E.* VII. xxx.

³ "Every king in his own realm and dominion is supreme head. . . . Nero was head of the Church, that is, in worldly respect of the temporal bodies of men, of whom the Church consisteth; for so he beheaded Peter

nothing more than a general reference to the language of the Apostles on the obedience due to constituted authority is required to justify it. It cannot, however, be seriously maintained that this is *all* that is intended by it. The conversion of the empire introduced a new state of things, and put the emperor into a new relation towards the Church. From this time forward a vague authority in the affairs of the Church was considered to be vested in him over and above his ordinary jurisdiction over all men. He was supposed to be in perfect harmony with the Church. His duty was to see its laws carried out; and to him it appertained to summon General Councils.¹ In later days, under the "Holy Roman Empire," the same thing is seen. It may be seen in the laws of Charles the Great, which "illustrate the action of a strong monarch. When a case could not be settled before the bishop or the metropolitan, he directed that it should be brought finally before himself. The Synods referred their decisions to him that they might be supplemented, amended, and confirmed. He claimed for himself the right and the duty of following the example of Josiah in endeavouring to bring back to God the kingdom committed to him, by visitation, correction, admonition, in virtue of his royal office."²

It is something of the same position and power which has been conceded to the sovereign in the Church of England; and the formal documents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which claim it as the "*ancient jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiastical*,"³ are perfectly

and the Apostles. And the Turk, too, is head of the Church of Turkey."

—Examination at Oxford, 1555; *Remains*, p. 219.

¹ Cf. *Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, p. xv.

² *Ib.* p. xvi., where see references.

³ Canon 1 of 1604. In the third Canon it is maintained that the sovereign has "the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian emperors of the primitive Church."

justified in their claim. "The early English laws prove that similar powers [to those claimed by Charles the Great] were exerted by the sovereigns before the Conquest; and throughout the medieval period the English king never surrendered his supreme visitatorial power, the power of determining finally, on his own responsibility and at his own discretion, the ecclesiastical relations of his subjects."¹ Or, as Mr. Wakeman puts it, "the constitutional character of the supremacy of the Crown . . . does not differ in principle from that exercised by William I. or Edward I., being in its essence the right of supervision over the administration of the Church, vested in the Crown as the champion of the Church, in order that the religious welfare of its subjects may be duly provided for."² Thus we maintain that, while its formal assertion in the sixteenth century grew out of the necessity for national resistance to foreign claims, yet the supremacy itself was no new thing. Questions of the utmost importance and delicacy may, of course, arise in connection with it; and in the present day, when the powers formerly exercised by the Crown have so largely passed from the personal control of the sovereign to the Parliament, a wholly new state of things has arisen. This has been greatly complicated by the unfortunate Act of 1833 (to say nothing of later legislation), which abolished the ancient Court of Delegates, in which the Crown appointed the members of the final Court of appeal in ecclesiastical causes, and transferred its powers to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But into the vexed question of the Ecclesiastical Courts there is no necessity to enter here. All that we are at present concerned with is this, viz. that since the Royal supremacy as explained to and accepted by the Church

¹ *Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, *ubi supra*.

² *Introduction to the History of the Church of England*, p. 321.

is for all practical purposes identical with that anciently enjoyed by the Crown in this country, there is no sort of reason why its formal assertion in and since the sixteenth century should be thought to cause a difficulty to loyal Churchmen. The "supreme headship" is not claimed. The extraordinary powers exercised by Henry VIII. and Edward VI. are no longer in force. These the Church repudiates as arbitrary and unconstitutional. The supreme governorship, as defined and limited in the formal documents cited above, she loyally accepts.¹

II. *The Papal Claims.*

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

The statement of the Article sums up as briefly as possible the position taken up by the Church of England in the sixteenth century. It is, of course, well known that during the previous centuries, although a Papal jurisdiction was freely admitted, yet resistance to the claims of Rome was not infrequent, and various Acts were passed to limit the powers of the Pope in this country. But the summary rejection of Papal jurisdiction, as a whole, belongs to the sixteenth century. The account of the steps taken by the Church and State, including the formal declaration by Convocation in 1534, that "the Pope of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in holy Scripture, in this

¹ It has been impossible to do more than give the briefest outline in regard to the very important subject discussed in this section. Reference has been frequently made in the notes to the *Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, as well as to Mr. Wakeman's valuable note on the subject. To these the reader is referred for fuller details; and with them mention should be made of Mr. Gladstone's famous letter to Bishop Blomfield, "*The Royal Supremacy as it is defined by reason, history, and the Constitution.*"

kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop,"¹ belongs to the province of ecclesiastical history, and there is no need to summarise the details here. What is required is to show that the action of the Church of England can be justified, and that the statement of the Article is true. If it be a fact that our Lord conferred upon S. Peter a position and power superior to that of the other Apostles, and that this has been transmitted to his successors in the see of Rome, so that the Pope is by Divine appointment head of the universal Church, then clearly the Church of England was in the wrong in asserting her freedom from his jurisdiction. What is necessary for us here, then, is to consider (a) the Scriptural grounds on which the Papal claims are based, and (b) the evidence from the early Church concerning these claims; for if it can be established that no position of "supremacy" involving universal jurisdiction was granted by our Lord to S. Peter, and no such position conceded to the bishops of Rome in primitive times, then it would seem to follow that the assertion of the Papal claims in later days was an unwarrantable usurpation, and that the Church of England was perfectly justified in the formal repudiation of them which it made in the sixteenth century.²

(a) *The Scriptural grounds on which the Papal claims are based.*

Three passages of the New Testament are quoted by

¹ See Dixon's *History of the Church of England*, vol. i. pp. 227, 238.

² The decree of the Vatican Council (1870), "Pastor Æternus," is so drawn as really to put out of court any appeal to theories of "development" in connection with the Roman claims, for it boldly asserts that the tradition received a *fidei Christianæ exordio* attests (1) the right of the bishop of Rome to a universal jurisdiction, plenary, supreme, ordinary, and immediate; and (2) his infallibility when defining *ex cathedra* a doctrine on faith and conduct as to be held by the Church universal. Cf. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 2.

modern Papalists—(1) the promise to S. Peter in S. Matthew xvi.; (2) our Lord's words to him in S. Luke xxii. 32; and (3) the threefold commission in S. John xxi. Of these the first is far the most important.

"I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

In considering this passage, it should be noticed that the words concerning "binding" and "loosing," here addressed to S. Peter, are afterwards spoken to the Apostles generally (c. xviii. 18). Consequently whatever power was conferred by them upon S. Peter was afterwards granted equally to the others. But the earlier part of the promise refers to S. Peter alone. Admitting, however, for the sake of argument that the "rock" is Peter himself, yet it still remains that the promise appears to be a strictly *personal* one. There is no indication whatever in it of any headship capable of transmission to a series of successors in his see. It is far more natural to take the words as referring by anticipation to the historical position taken by S. Peter in the foundation of the Church, and to see its fulfilment in the early chapters of the Acts, where S. Peter takes the lead throughout, but nowhere claims for himself any powers not enjoyed by the other Apostles, nor acts apart from them. In order to establish the Roman interpretation of the passage, which is certainly not suggested by its terms, it would be necessary to show that from the very first there had existed a strong tradition in the Church thus interpreting it, and referring to it as establishing the Papal claims to headship. *But*

*this is absolutely wanting.*¹ And if this passage breaks down it will scarcely be contended that anything can be proved in favour of the Papacy from S. Luke xxii. 32, or from S. John xxi. The former of these ("I have made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, stablish thy brethren") is apparently never applied in favour of the Papal claims before the seventh century;² and when the threefold denial of S. Peter is remembered, the threefold commission of S. John xxi. ("Feed My lambs . . . Feed My sheep . . . Feed My sheep") becomes at once his natural restoration to his office, and cannot be regarded as investing him with any position of superiority to the other Apostles.³ But if the appeal is made to Scripture, we must not be content with the consideration of these three passages alone. There are other passages besides these which really bear on the question of the Papal claims, for the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles show us the real position historically occupied by the Apostle, and make it clear it was very far from being one of "headship" in the sense of authority over the whole Church. Certainly in the early chapters of the Acts S. Peter takes the lead in action. But to take the lead in action is one thing; to claim to be supreme head is quite another. And against the notion that his position was one of such authority must be set such facts as these. His conduct is called in question by others, and he vindicates it before the Church (Acts xi. 1-4). S. Paul on one occasion does not hesitate to "resist him to the face, because he stood condemned" (Gal. ii. 11). He is "sent" together with John by the Apostles to Samaria

¹ See Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 327 *seq.*, where the passage is fully considered; and cf. Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. ii. p. 481 *seq.*

² Salmon, *op. cit.* p. 336.

³ *Ib.* p. 339.

(Acts viii. 14). At the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv.) he is not even president: this position being occupied by S. James, who sums up the debate and gives his decision (*διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω*, ver. 19). This of itself seems conclusive, for it is inconceivable that if our Lord had invested S. Peter with any such authority as that now claimed by the Pope as his successor, any but he could have presided on such an occasion. We may, then, safely say that, while a primacy of repute and honour may be rightly conceded to S. Peter among the Twelve,¹ there is not a shred of evidence in the New Testament that he was ever more than *primus inter pares*, or that even this primacy was capable of being transmitted to others.²

(b) *The evidence of the early Church concerning the Papal claims.*—Let it be admitted that the evidence for S. Peter's visit to Rome, and for regarding him as co-founder with S. Paul of the Church there, is sufficient; and that the succession of bishops in that see may be traced back to him. Yet it does not follow that S. Peter was ever "bishop" of Rome in the modern sense, any more than S. Paul was "bishop" of the various Churches which he founded, or, indeed, of Rome itself. But even if his Episcopate could be proved, we should still be

¹ The position of S. Peter's name as standing *first* in all the lists of the Apostles given in the New Testament, together with the fact that in the list in the Gospel according to S. Matthew the word *πρῶτος* is attached to it (c. x. 2), would seem to point to something like a *primacy* belonging to him. But primacy is not supremacy.

² It must be remembered that we have S. Peter's own Epistles, as well as the accounts of his proceedings and speeches in the Acts; and it is a simple fact that nowhere does he give "the faintest hint of any consciousness of such office as Papalism assigns to him. This is not a mere argument *ex silentio*; if S. Peter had been, by Christ's commission, His unique Vicar, the monarch and oracle of the growing Church, a polity so simple and intelligible must have found expression in Apostolic writings, and could not have been ignored by the 'Vicar' himself."—Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 8.

justified in asking for evidence that subsequent bishops inherited from him a position of headship involving universal jurisdiction. And this is just what is not forthcoming. While in later times there is abundant evidence of lofty claims made by the Popes, and (sometimes) admitted by others, in the earlier centuries such language is markedly absent. Attention has recently been drawn to this part of our subject, and the question has been investigated afresh with the greatest care, with the result that it has been conclusively shown, in Dr. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, and in the Rev. F. W. Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, that during the early centuries nothing whatever was known of the claims made for the Papacy in later times. From the first the Roman Church was invested with a position of great importance in Christendom. Rome was the capital of the world. It was the meeting place for Christians of different nationalities. To it, as to a natural centre, men gravitated from all countries.¹ And thus its bishop came to occupy a position of ever-increasing importance. But history shows us quite clearly that in

¹ Something of this kind is evidently intended by Irenæus in the famous passage in his works (unfortunately only existing in the Latin translation). "Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorum (v.l. potiorum) principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio" (III. iii.). Irenæus does not mean that every Church "must" as a matter of duty "agree with" the Roman Church on account of its "potentior principalitas"; but that the faithful from all parts "are sure to" (*necesse est*, it is a matter of course) "come together" there. "It is inevitable, S. Irenæus means, that Christians from all other parts of the empire should, from time to time, for various reasons, visit the Church in the great centre of the empire: this is a process which is always going on, which cannot but go on" (Bright, *Roman See*, p. 32). The "superior pre-eminence" belongs, it will be noticed, not to the *bishop*, but to the *Church*, or possibly to the *city*. See Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 375 seq. (c. xx.), and Puller's *Primitive Saints*, p. 19 seq. (ed. 3), and cf. Bright, as above.

the second century it was the *Church*, not the *bishop*, to which a kind of primacy was given. The Papal theory inverts this, and makes the importance of the Church depend upon that of the bishop.¹ It is only towards the close of the second century that for the first time we meet with an attempt on the part of a bishop of Rome to assert his authority outside his own proper sphere.² This, however, altogether failed. The action of Victor in attempting to procure a general excommunication of the Quartodeciman Churches of Asia did not commend itself to the other bishops of the West, who (we are told) "rather sharply rebuked him,"³ an expression which could not by any possibility have been used by the historian had the notion of the Papal headship been then in existence.

In the third century the correspondence of S. Cyprian and the history of the controversies in which he was engaged afford us considerable insight into the position then occupied by the bishop of Rome. There is no question that S. Cyprian regarded the see of Rome as the symbol and centre of unity; but his actions,⁴ as well as his words,⁵ make it clear that in his view "the function

¹ The well-known decree of Constantinople (381), which raised the see of that city to the second place in Christendom "because it is the new Rome," shows very plainly the origin of the importance of the bishop of Rome. The canon was confirmed at Chalcedon (451), when it was laid down that the first place belonged to the see of Rome "because that is the imperial city." On the protests of the Roman legates, and the refusal of Leo I. to recognise this, see Salmon's *Infallibility*, p. 416.

² The account is given in Eusebius, V. xxiv. xxv.

³ *Ἐφέρονται δὲ καὶ αἱ τούτων φωναί, πληκτικώτερον καταπομπέων τοῦ Βικτορος*, Euseb. *l.c.*

⁴ Mention may be made of (1) his persistent opposition to the Roman view of the validity of heretical baptism, and (2) his attitude in regard to appeals, as shown in the case of the Spanish bishops, Basilides and Martial, where he set aside altogether the judgment of Pope Stephen, *Ep.* lxvii.

⁵ For Cyprian's view of S. Peter's position reference should be made to *Epp.* xxxiii., xlv. 1, xlvi. 3, lix. 14, lxx. 3, lxxiii. 7; and *De*

of the Roman see in relation to unity was ideal and typical; it carried with it no jurisdiction, no right to dictate."¹

During the early years of the fourth century the history of the Donatist schism supplies an incidental witness that Rome was not the final authority, for, after the question had been referred by the emperor to Melchisedes, bishop of Rome, with a few others, the decision of the Council held by him was reviewed by a larger Council held at Arles, in order that a more authoritative settlement of the question might be arrived at.²

Not until we come to the Council of Sardica, in 343, do we find any *legal* rights beyond those of other bishops granted to the bishops of Rome; and even then the right of hearing appeals in certain cases was a strictly limited one, and was granted by the Council as a new thing, as a matter of ecclesiastical order, and not based on any Divine right or inherent authority of the see of Rome.³ In after years the canon was frequently, though wrongly, appealed to as "Nicene,"⁴ and the confusion was undoubtedly advantageous to the interests of Rome. To this canon may be traced the *beginning* of whatever legal rights of jurisdiction over other Churches were afterwards acquired by the see of

Unit. iv. Cf. Bright's *Roman See*, p. 39 *seq.*; and for the famous interpolation in the last of these passages see *The Pope and the Council*, by "Janus," p. 127.

¹ Robertson in *Church Historical Society Lectures*, vol. ii. p. 230.

² "On papal principles [the Emperor] ought, of course, to have upheld, as by Divine right final, a judgment affirmed by the Roman see. But nothing of the kind occurred to him, or to any one else at the time."—Bright, p. 63, where see the whole account of the incident.

³ The canon in question (Canon iii.) may be seen in Hefele, *Councils*, vol. ii. p. 112; and on it see Bright, p. 85 *seq.*, and Puller, p. 140 *seq.* (ed. 3).

⁴ They were so quoted by Zosimus in the case of Apiarius (Bright, p. 136), as also by Leo I. and others.

Rome. In earlier days, while there is ample evidence of the importance of the *Church*, and of the growing influence of the *bishop*, it is only moral influence, and not legal right of jurisdiction, that can be found. Into the history of the extension of the legal jurisdiction, and the growth of the temporal power (resting largely on forgeries¹), there is no necessity to enter here. In what has been already said it has been sufficiently indicated how there is a complete lack of evidence in the early centuries for the claims subsequently made, and how the power was a matter of gradual growth. The barest outline of the argument has been all that space permitted. Details must be sought in the able works referred to in the text and the footnotes.

III. *The Lawfulness of Capital Punishment.*

The laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

This subject admits of the briefest treatment. No question can be raised as to the lawfulness of capital punishment under the Old Covenant. Not only was it expressly commanded in various cases under the Mosaic law: but even before the law was given, it was laid down by Divine command that "whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" (Gen. ix. 6). The New Testament nowhere contains an express reversal of this rule. Consequently it can scarcely be maintained that capital punishment is forbidden by the law of God: and no more than this is required. All that the Article asserts is that "the laws of the realm *may* punish Christian men with

¹ On the "false decretals" and the "donation of Constantine," see *The Pope and the Council*, pp. 94 and 131.

death" in certain cases. Into the question whether capital punishment is *advisable* or not there is no need to enter. That is a matter on which opinions may differ, and with which we are not here concerned, for subscription to this statement of the Article will remain unaffected, however it be decided.

IV. *The Lawfulness of War.*

It is lawful for Christian men, at the command of the Magistrate, to wear weapons and serve in the wars (*justa bella administrare*). Once more brevity must be studied, although the question now before us is involved in much greater perplexity than that which has just been considered. All that can here be said is this. Christianity accepted society and social institutions as it found them; but laid down principles which were intended gradually to alter and abolish what was wrong in them. So slavery was accepted by the gospel. There is not one word in the New Testament which directly condemns it. But the principle of brotherhood was proclaimed, and this has so wrought in the hearts of men that it has at length brought about the abolition of slavery in Christian communities. In the same way Christianity accepted war. Our Lord and His Apostles never urged soldiers to give up their calling.¹ But it is hard to resist the conclusion that the principles which are laid down in the gospel *ought*, if they had honestly been applied on a wide scale, to have led long ago to the disuse of war, at least between Christian nations. What is required is that the principles of Christianity should so leaven society that war should become an impossibility. But

¹ See also the directions of the Baptist to the "men on the march" who asked him what they should do, in S. Luke iii. 14.

until this happy result is brought about, in the face of the absence of any directions in the New Testament to soldiers requiring them to forsake their calling, it can scarcely be maintained that it is *not* "lawful for Christian men to wear weapons and serve in the wars." It may be added that the numerous allusions to the military life as affording instructive lessons and analogies to the life of the Christian, appear not only to be based on the supposition that the life thus referred to is in itself a lawful one, but also to indicate that it is especially favourable to the development of certain very essential moral qualities.¹

¹ Reference should be made to the masterly sermon on "War" in Mozley's *University Sermons*, No. V., as well as to the late Aubrey Moore's paper on the same subject in the *Report of the Portsmouth Church Congress*.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

*De illicita bonorum Communica-
tione.*

*Of Christian men's goods which
are not common.*

Facultates et bona Christianorum non sunt communia quoad jus et possessionem, ut quidam Anabaptistæ falso jactant. Debet tamen quisque de his quæ possidet, pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus eleemosynas benigne distribuere.

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

THERE has been no alteration whatever in this Article (except in the form of the title¹) since it was first drawn up in 1553. The error of the Anabaptists condemned in it is described more fully in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, from which we learn that the opinion of the community of goods was in some cases pushed to such an extent that it was made to include and justify a community of wives.²

¹ Christianorum bona non sunt communia. Christian men's goods are not common. 1553 and 1563.

² *De Hæres.* c. 14: "*De communitate bonorum et uxorum.* Excludatur etiam ab eisdem Anabaptistis inducta bonorum et possessionum communitas, quam tantopere urgent, ut nemini quicquam relinquunt proprium et suum. In quo mirabiliter loquuntur, cum furta prohiberi divina Scriptura cernant, et eleemosynas in utroque Testamento laudari videant, quas ex propriis facultatibus nostris elargimur; quorum sane neutrum consistere posset, nisi Christianis proprietas bonorum et possessionum suarum relinqueretur. Emergunt etiam ex Anabaptistarum lacunis quidam Nicolaitæ, inquinatissimi sane homines, qui fœminarum, imo et uxorum disputant usum per omnes promiscue pervagari debere.

The two subjects of which the Article speaks are these—

1. The community of goods.
2. The duty of almsgiving.

I. *The Community of Goods.*

The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast.

The notion of the Anabaptists here condemned probably originated in a misunderstanding of S. Luke's words in the Acts of the Apostles. Two passages have often been cited in proof of the assertion that Communism proper was the system that originally prevailed in the Apostolic Church, and from them it has been concluded that the same system ought to be practised now, and that consequently the possession of private property by individuals is contrary to the spirit of Christianity.

The passages in question are the following:—

Acts ii. 44, 45: "All that believed were together, and had all things common; and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as any man had need."

C. iv. 32: "And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul; and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common" (*ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά*).

Quæ fœda illorum et conscelerata libido primum pietati contraria est et sacris literis, deinde cum universa civili honestate, et naturali illa incorruptaque in mentibus nostris accensa luce vehementer pugnat." Cf. also the quotations given above on p. 761; and see Hermann's *Consultation* (Eng. tr.), fol. cxi.

These passages, however, do not stand alone; and a careful consideration of the whole account given by S. Luke of the early Church in Jerusalem, shows conclusively that what he is here describing is not so much an institution as a temper and spirit. Most certainly the rights of private property were not superseded. Mary the mother of John Mark still retained her own house (Acts xii. 12); while the words of S. Peter to Ananias prove that no necessity was laid upon him to sell his property, "Whilst it remained, did it not remain thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" Moreover, as will be shown below, there are various injunctions to liberality in almsgiving in the Apostolic Epistles which are incompatible with Communism, for where a strict system of this kind is practised, and the rights of property are superseded, personal almsgiving becomes an impossibility. There are no "rich" to be charged to be "ready to give and glad to distribute."

It may be added, that while there there is no trace elsewhere of any system of Communism adopted by the Church, yet expressions are used by later writers¹ which afford striking parallels to those employed by S. Luke, and show us that no violence is done to his words if they are understood of the eager, enthusiastic spirit of love which so prevailed among the early Christians as to lead them to regard whatever they possessed as at the disposal

¹ Thus in the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων* we read: "If thou have in thine hands, thou shalt give for ransom of thy sins. Thou shalt not hesitate to give, neither shalt thou grudge when thou givest: for thou shalt know who is the recompenser of the reward. Thou shalt not turn aside from him that needeth, but shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thine own; for if ye are fellow-sharers in that which is perishable, how much more in the things that are perishable," c. iv. Tertullian also writes as follows: "One in mind and soul, we do not hesitate to share our earthly goods with one another. *All things are common among us, but our wives*," Apol. xxxix.

of their brethren; and not of any formal or systematic plan of Communism.¹

II. *The Duty of Almsgiving.*

Every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

That almsgiving is a Christian duty scarcely needs formal proof. It is sufficient to refer to—

(1) Our Lord's words in the Sermon on the Mount, where He does not command it, but rather *takes for granted* that His followers will practise it, and gives directions concerning the manner of doing it, as He does also with regard to the two other duties of prayer and fasting (S. Matthew vi. 1 *seq.*; cf. also S. Luke xii. 33).

(2) The directions concerning it in the Apostolic Epistles,² *e.g.* "Charge them that are rich in this present world . . . that they do good, that they be rich in good works, that they be ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the life which is life indeed," 1 Tim. vi. 17-19.

¹ On the position of some modern Communists, who affirm that Communism was the natural outcome of the Law of Equality implied in Christ's teaching, and maintain that "Jesus Christ Himself not only proclaimed, preached, and prescribed Communism as a consequence of fraternity, but practised it with His Apostles" (Cabet, *Voyage en Icarie*, p. 567); see Kaufmann's *Socialism and Communism*, c. i.; and on the relation between Religion and Socialism, see Flint's *Socialism*, c. xi.

² The Second Book of the Homilies contains a plain Homily on the subject of "almsdeeds and mercifulness towards the poor and needy," in which the Scriptural directions on the subject from the Old Testament (including the Apocrypha), as well as from the New, are collected together, p. 406 (S.P.C.K.).

"To do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased," Heb. xiii. 16.

Cf. also Rom. xii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; 2 Cor. ix. 7; 1 John iii. 17, etc.

ARTICLE XXXIX

De jurejurando.

Quemadmodum juramentum vanum et temerarium a Domino nostro Jesu Christo, et Apostolo ejus Jacobo Christianis hominibus interdictum esse fatemur: ita Christianam religionem minime prohibere censemus, quin jubente Magistratu, in causa fidei et charitatis, jurare liceat, modo id fiat juxta Prophetæ doctrinam, in justitia, in judicio, et veritate.

Of a Christian man's oath.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle: so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

LIKE the one just considered, this Article, which has remained without change since 1553, is aimed against a tenet of the Anabaptists, which is also condemned in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*.

"Præterea nec juramentorum Anabaptistæ legitimum relinquunt usum, in quo contra Scripturarum sententiam et veteris Testamenti patrum exempla, Pauli etiam apostoli, imo Christi, imo Dei Patris procedunt; quorum juramenta sæpe sunt in sacris literis repetita," etc.¹

There are two passages of the New Testament which have appeared to others besides the Anabaptists to forbid the taking of an oath in any case.² They are (a) our Lord's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, and (b) the very similar words of S. James.

¹ *De Hæres.* c. 15. *De juramentis et participatione dominicæ Cœnæ*, and cf. the quotations given above under Art. XXXVII. p. 761.

² Not only the Quakers of later days, but some among the Christian Fathers took this view.

(a) S. Matt. v. 33-37: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of His feet; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great king. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one."

(b) S. James v. 12: "Above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay (*or*, 'let yours be the yea, yea, and the nay, nay,' *R.V. marg.*); that ye fall not under judgment."

These are evidently the passages to which the Article alludes, when it says that **we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle**. And it is tolerably clear that in neither passage is the formal tendering of oaths in a law court under consideration. Such a solemn act is referred to in the Epistle to the Hebrews in terms which conclusively indicate that the writer of the Epistle saw nothing wrong in it. "Men swear by the greater: and in every dispute of theirs the oath is final for confirmation" (Heb. vi. 16). So S. Paul, several times in the course of his Epistles, makes a solemn appeal to God, which is a form of oath (2 Cor. i. 23, xi. 10, 31, xii. 19; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8), and in one instance uses the expression *νῆ τῆν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν*, 1 Cor. xv. 31. And there are references to God as swearing by Himself, which it would be difficult to reconcile with the idea that there is anything essentially wrong in a solemn asseveration or oath, in order to gain credence for a statement (Heb. iii. 11, vi. 16, 17). But,

further, what seems quite decisive is the fact that when our Lord was solemnly adjured by the high priest, *i.e.* put on His oath, He did not refuse to answer. See S. Matt. xxvi. 62-64, "And the high priest stood up, and said unto Him, Answerest Thou nothing? What is it which these witness against Thee? But Jesus held His peace. And the high priest said unto Him, I adjure Thee by the living God (*ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*) that Thou tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God? Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." In this case, as in others, our Lord's actions form the best commentary upon the meaning of His words, and prove decisively that the reference in the Sermon on the Mount is, as the Article takes it, to "vain and rash swearing." S. James' words are apparently directly founded on our Lord's,¹ and there is nothing in them to lead us to think that he is contemplating anything more than ordinary conversation and the use of oaths in it. We conclude, therefore, that there is nothing in Holy Scripture which need raise any scruple in the minds of Christians as to the lawfulness of acquiescing when solemnly put upon their oath. Whether the use of oaths by the Legislature is advisable is another matter, on which we are not called upon to offer an opinion. A man may regret the custom, and feel that it brings with it grave dangers of the profanation of sacred things, and encourages the false idea of a double standard of truthfulness, and yet hold that **Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to**

¹ This is made very plain if the marginal rendering of the Revised Version be adopted.

the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth. The "prophet," whose "teaching" is here referred to, is the prophet Jeremiah, who says (iv. 2), "Thou shalt swear, As the Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness";¹ and if judicial oaths are permissible at all, it can only be on these conditions.

¹ "Et jurabis: Vivit Dominus in veritate, et in iudicio, et in iustitia" (Vulgate). The passage is quoted in the Homily "Against Swearing and Perjury" (p. 73, S.P.C.K.), where the whole question of the lawfulness of oaths is also argued.

INDEX

- AACHEN, Council of, 222.
 Abbot, Archbishop, 48.
 Abelard, 111.
 Addis and Arnold, 472, 553, 659.
 Admonition to Parliament, 53, 458, 747.
 Adoration, Eucharistic, 667.
 A Lasco, John, 23, 643.
 Albertus Magnus, 149, 435, 692.
 Alexander, Archbishop, 591.
 Alexander of Hales, 435.
 Alexandria, Church of, 507.
 Alexandria, Council of, 109.
 Alley, Bishop, on the descent into hell, 160; on the Old Testament, 281.
 Almsgiving, teaching of Scripture on, 786.
 Ambrose, 219, 314, 360, 426.
 Amphilochius, 249, 265.
 Anabaptists, 22, 24, 125, 282, 358, 336, 398, 441, 455, 574, 588, 616, 760, 783, 788.
 Ancyra, Council of, 700, 711.
 Andrewes, Bishop, 47, 554, 660, 663.
 Anselm, 155, 701.
 Antioch, Church of, 507; Council of, 769.
 Apiarius, the case of, 779.
 Apocrypha, 274; Jerome on, 276; Hooker on, 278.
 Apollinaris, heresy of, 135.
 Apostles' Creed, history of, 305; origin of name, 313; text of, 315.
 Apostolical succession, 577, 740.
Apostolicae Curæ, the Papal Bull, 752.
 Aquinas, 171, 406, 435, 560, 598, 609, 670, 678.
 Aristides, 140, 299.
 Arminianism, 470.
 Arnold, T., 490.
 Artemon, heresy of, 105.
 Arundel, Archbishop, Constitutions of, 561.
 Ascension of Christ, 189.
 Assembly of Divines, 370, 376.
 Athanasian Creed, not the work of Athanasius, 329; a Latin Creed, 329; origin of name, 330; controversy on date, 331; internal evidence of date, 332; external evidence, 333; MSS. of, 336; contained in early collections of canons, 338; commentaries on, 339; used by early writers, 340; probable date of, 343; use made of, by the Church of England, 344; contents of, 345; objections to, 346; mistranslations in, 347; text of, 353.
 Athanasius, use of *Hypostasis*, 107; on the *Monarchia*, 116; on *Homousios*, 126; on Sabellianism, 206; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 242; on the Canon of Scripture, 256; on blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, 446; on the powers of the Church, 521; on Councils, 534.
 Athenagoras, 105, 205.
 Atonement, doctrine of, 150; theories of, 154; reveals the Father's love, 154; a mystery, 157; complete and sufficient, 688. Cf. 439.
 Augsburg, Confession of. See *Confession*.
 Augustine, on the Trinity, 101, 111, 112; on eternal generation, 123; on the divinity of Christ, 129; on the descent into hell, 167, 171; on the presence of Christ as man, 196; on the Macedonians, 208; on the procession of the Holy Spirit, 219; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 242; on the Canon of Scripture, 250, 256; on the Creed, 300; coincidences with the Athanasian Creed, 332, 345; on original sin, 360, 371; on grace, 383; on justification, 393; on good works, 410; on works before justification, 423; on predestination, 478; on ceremonies, 517; on purgatory, 545; on miracles, 558; on invocation of saints, 566; on sacraments, 596; on the Eucharist, 671.
 Augustine of Canterbury, 518.
 Autun, Council of, 333.
 BANCROFT, Bishop, 482.
 Baptism, effect of, in removing original sin, 373; lay, 505; Zwinglian and Anabaptist teaching on, 621; teaching of the Church on, 623; blessings of, 623; relation to confirmation, 630; of infants, Scriptural arguments for, 635; patristic evidence for, 637. See also *Regeneration*.
 Barlow, Bishop, consecration of, 751.
 Barnabas, Epistle of, 270.
 Basil, 206, 565, 566.
 Baxter, R., 56.
 Bede, 171.
 Bellarmine, 549, 613.
 Bengel, 115, 147.
 Beringar, 650.
 Bigg, C., 108.
 Blackburne, Archdeacon, 63.
 Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, 447.
 Bona, Cardinal, 677.
 Bonaventura, 435, 567.
 Boniface VIII., 432.
 Boxley, Rood of, 561.
 Braga, Council of, 713.
 Bramhall, Archbishop, 660, 746.
 Bright, W., 507, 690, 773, 776.
 Brightman, F. E., 694, 755.
 Brown, Bishop H., on the Articles, 144, 172, 242, 244, 330, 465, 607, 632, 660.
 Bull, Bishop, 365, 413, 416.
 Burke, Edmund, 63.
 Burnet, Bishop, 18, 47, 660.
 Butler, Bishop, on the Atonement, 157.
 CÆSAREA, Baptismal Creed of, 316.
 Cæsarius of Arles, 309, 342.
 Cajetan, Cardinal, 572.
 Calvin, 385, 446, 474, 590.
 Canon of Scripture, meaning of the term, 248; method of determining, 250; difference between England and Rome on, 252; evidence on which the Canon of the New Testament rests, 261.
 Capital punishment, 780.
 Carthage, Council of, 257, 699.
 Cassian, 304.
 Celibacy of the clergy, history of, 696.
 Ceremonial Law of Moses not binding on Christians, 294.
 Cerinthus, 711.
 Chalcedon, Council of, 533.
 Charisius of Philadelphia, 225.
 Charlemagne, 221, 313, 337.
 Charles the Bald, 337.
 Cheke, Sir J., 13, 19, 654.
 Chrysostom, 192, 214, 471.
 Church, use of the word in Scripture, 497; the visible, 498; invisible, meaning of phrase, 499; Scripture proof of visibility of, 500; notes of, 502; legislative power of, 514; judicial power of, 520; a witness and keeper of Scripture, 526; particular or national, 717.
 Church authority, in relation to private judgment, 525.
 Church, Dean, 371.
 Clarke, Dr. S., 111.
 Clement of Alexandria, 171, 248, 275, 366, 471, 544, 698, 741.
 Clement of Rome, 104, 205, 248, 270, 467, 578, 739.
 Clermont, Council of, 430, 678.
 Clovesho, Council of, 567.
Communicatio idiomatum, 138.
 Communion of Saints, 311.
 Community of goods, 784.
 Concomitance, doctrine of, 683.

Concupiscence, 375, 377.
Confessio Basiliensis, 9.
Confessio Belgica, 10.
Confessio Gallicana, 10, 376.
Confessio Helvetica, 10, 369.
 Confession of Augsburg, 8, 90, 120, 198, 232, 358, 388, 445, 493, 573, 587, 592, 616, 642, 680, 692, 761.
 Confession of Württemberg, 9, 120, 198, 232, 378, 388, 410, 513, 587.
 Confirmation, 604, 630.
 Constance, Council of, 431, 679.
 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 559.
 Constantinople, first Council of, 215, 533; second Council of, 533; third Council of, 533; seventh Council of, 559; eighth Council of, 559.
 Constantinople, Creed of, 324.
 Convocation, were the Forty-Two Articles submitted to it? 15.
Corpus Christi, Festival of, 666.
 Cosin, Bishop, 49.
 Councils. See *General Councils*.
 Counsels and precepts, 437.
 Cranmer, Archbishop, prepares the Forty-Two Articles, 12; his accounts of the title to them, 17; on the Eucharist, 642-674; his marriage, 702; on the Royal Supremacy, 769. See also 5, 7, 28, 258.
 Creeds, origin of, 297; indications of, in New Testament, 297; early forms of, 298; interrogative forms of, 300; introduced into the liturgy, 300; used as tests of orthodoxy, 301; difference between Eastern and Western, 302.
 Creighton, Bishop, 435, 556.
 Cup, denial of, to the laity, 506; condemned by early writers, 677; gradual growth of the practice, 679; rejected by the Church of England, 680; grounds of the rejection, 681.
 Curteis, Canon, 68.
 Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 105, 307, 360, 427, 453, 555, 595, 639, 711, 778.
 Cyprian, Bishop of Toulon, 309.
 Cyril of Alexandria, 216.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, catechetical lectures of, 207, 300; on the Canon, 255, 265; on the term Apocryphal, 276; creed of, 321; on the administration of the Eucharist, 677.
 Cyril Lucar, Confession of, 259.
 DALE, R. W., 147, 148.
 Decentius of Eugubium, 606.
 Deity, properties of, 139.
 Denebert, Bishop, 341.
 Denny and Lacey, 749.
 Descent into hell, change in the Article on, 160. See also *Hell, descent into*.
 Diaconate, origin of, 733.
Diatessaron of Tatian, 269.
 Diocesan System, origin of, 738.
 Diogenes of Cyzicus, 322.
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 107.
 Dionysius of Rome, 107.
 Dionysius the Areopagite, 597.
 Divinity of the Son, proved from Scripture, 127; of the Spirit, 199.
 Dixon, Canon R. W., 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 17, 29, 561.
 Docetism, 145.
 Donatism, 779.
 Double procession, the doctrine of, 211; objections to, 224.
 Driver, Dr., 164, 286, 291, 292.
 ELECTION, 466 *seq.*
 Elvira, Council of, 558, 698.
 Enoch, Book of, 164, 287.
 Ephesus, seventh canon of the Council of, 225; ratifies the Creed of Nicæa, 324. Cf. 530, 523.
 Ephraem the Syrian, 565.
 Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, on Montanism, 205; creeds given by, 319. Cf. 208, 215, 324, 557.
 Episcopacy, history of, 731; how far necessary, 744.
 Episcopal succession, Church of England, Roman objections to, 748.
 Erasmus, 568.
 Estcourt, 750.
 Eternal generation of the Son, 123.
 Eucharist, changes in the Article on, 644; teaching on, 647; adoption of, 667; elevation of, 666; reservation of, 666.

Eusebius of Cæsarea on the Canon of the New Testament, 266; on the Creed of Nicæa, 316.
 Eutyches, heresy of, 136.
 Excommunication, Jewish, 706; Christian, 707; Scriptural grounds of, 708; history of, 710; canons concerning, 713.
 Extreme Unction, 605.
 FAITH, use of the word in Scripture, 399; why the instrument of justification, 404. See also *Justification*.
 Fall, the, effect of, 367; Scripture proof of, 370.
 Farrar, Dean, 457.
Fides infirmis and formata, 406.
 Field, Dean, 570.
 Flesh and bones, meaning of the term, 188.
 Florence, Council of, 547, 598.
 Forbes, Bishop A., 481, 591.
 Forbes, Bishop W., 422, 568, 572.
Formula Concordiæ, 369.
 Fortunatus, commentary of, on the Athanasian Creed, 334.
 Forty-Two Articles, history of their preparation, 12; had they the authority of Convocation, 15; their substance and object, 20; not intended to be a permanent test, 25; their sources, 26; how far dependent on the Confession of Augsburg, 26; their test, 70.
 Francis a Sancta Clara, 440, 617.
 Frankfurt, Council of, 222, 560.
 Freeman, Archdeacon, 203.
 Freeman, E. A., 701, 702.
 Freewill, teaching of the Article on, 379; Council of Trent on, 380.
 Fuller, Church History, 15, 750.
 Fust, Sir H. J., 728.
 Future life, doctrine of, in the Old Testament, 287.
 GALLICAN additions to the creed, 309.
 Gangra, Council of, 698.
 Gardiner, S. R., 48.
 Gascoigne, *Liber Veritatum*, 433, 702.
 Gelasius, 678.
 General Councils, may not be gathered together without the consent of princes, 532; may err, 534; have erred, 535; their

authority, 536; recognised by the Church of England, 536.
Generaliter, meaning of the word, 486.
 Good works, 404; teaching of the Article on, 412; follow after justification, 413.
 Gore, C., 98, 103, 125, 130, 144, 473, 659, 732.
 Gottschale, 475.
 Goulburn, Dean, 502, 516, 527.
 Grace, teaching of the Articles on, 380; teaching of Scripture on, 382; teaching of the Prayer Book on, 382; preventing and co-operating, 382; *de congruo and de condigno*, 418.
 Gregory the Great, 518, 547.
 Gregory VII., 701.
 Gregory Nazianzen, 210, 256, 265, 565, 566.
 Gregory Nyssen, 565.
 Gregory of Bergamo, 597.
 Guest, Bishop, share in the preparation of the Articles, 30; suggests further changes, 45; on Article XVII., 487; on Article XXVIII., 646, 662; on Article XXIX., 45, 669.
 HADES, 163. See also *Hell*.
 Hadrian I., 221, 337.
 Hadrian II., 337.
 Haimo of Halberstadt, 650.
 Hall, Bishop, 745.
 Hamant, Matthew, 120, 490.
 Hampton Court Conference, 54, 482.
 Hardwick on the Articles, 19, 25, 31, 39, 46, 51, 281, 386, 417, 512, 717.
 Hatfield, Council of, 220.
 Hebrews, Epistle to, hard passages in, 449.
 Hefele, Bishop, 256, 258.
 Hell, meaning of the word, 163.
 Hell, descent into, Scriptural grounds of doctrine, 166; object of, 169; early belief in, 175; history of the Article of the Creed on, 177; criticism of Pearson on, 179.
 Hermann, Archbishop, consultation of, 398, 575, 589, 761.
 Hermas, 205, 270.
 Hicourtley, Professor, 177, 310, 322.

- Heylin, 15.
 Hilary of Arles, 332.
 Hilary of Poitiers, 110, 218, 256.
 Hildebert of Tours, 684.
 Hincmar, 650.
 Hippolytus, 108.
 Holy Communion. See *Eucharist*.
 Holy Ghost, addition of Article on, 198; Divinity of, 199; distinct personality of, 201; history of the doctrine of, 204; procession of, 209; blasphemy against, 446 *seq.*
 Holy Scripture, changes in the Article on, 231; sufficient for salvation, 234; decree of the Council of Trent on, 235; the Fathers on, 242; the Canon of, 248.
 Holywood, 749.
 Homilies, History of, 723; authors of, 724, 726; nature of assent to, 726; on the doctrine of a future life, 293; on justification, 407; on the Church, 494; on Councils, 536; on adoration of images, 561; on invocation of saints, 568; on the sacraments, 592, 600; on almsgiving, 786; on oaths, 791.
Homoousios, meaning of the term, 125; adopted at Nicæa, 125; objections to, 126.
 Hooker, R., *Ecclesiastical Polity* of, 47; on the Incarnation, 136, 143; on the *communicatio idiomatum*, 138; on the gift of unction, 142; on the presence of Christ as man, 195; on the sufficiency of Scripture, 251; on the Apocrypha, 278; on preaching, 503; on the Church of Rome, 509; on the authority of the Church, 520; on Baptism, 624; on the Eucharist, 659, 663; on ceremonies, 720; on the ministry, 745; on the formula of ordination, 747; on intention, 756.
 Hooper, Bishop, on the Articles, 13; on the Anabaptists, 22, 145, 441, 486, 490; on the descent into hell, 162; on the Church, 499.
 Horsley, Bishop, 165, 178.
 Hort, F. J. A., on Genesis i.-iii., 363; on Article XIII., 422; on Article XXII., 553.
 Humanity of Christ, perfect, 141; sinless, 442.
 Humphrey, 41, 646.
 Hypostasis, history of the word, 107.
 Hypostatic union, the, 137.
 ICONOCLASTIC controversy, the, 558.
 Ignatius, 104, 140, 175, 205, 210, 270, 467, 738.
 Illingworth's *Bampton Lectures*, 103.
 Images, adoration of, 557 *seq.*
 Immaculate conception, the, 440.
 Imparted righteousness, 405.
 Incarnation, doctrine of, 137 *seq.*
 Indefective grace, 457.
 Indulgences, 426 *seq.*, 554 *seq.*
Inferi and *Inferna*, 163.
 Innocent I., 606, 701.
 Innocent III., 652.
 Institution of a Christian man, 5, 372, 508, 599, 609.
 Intention, doctrine of, 755 *seq.*
 Invocation of saints, the, 564 *seq.*
 Irenæus, 140, 153, 175, 241, 269, 275, 298, 303, 470, 557, 638, 777.
 Irresistible grace, 477.
 JAMES, on justification, 401; bishop of Jerusalem, 734.
 Jerome on the word *hypostasis*, 111; on the Apocrypha, 232, 256; on the term *Canonical*, 250, 275; on the Creed, 307, 314; on worship, 583.
 Jerusalem, Church of, 507.
 Jesus Christ. See *Son of God*.
 Jewel, Bishop, 44, 195, 764, 766, 769.
 John VIII., 430.
 Josephus, 253.
 Judgment, the last, 196.
 Julius, Pope, 534.
 Justification, use of the word in Scripture, 390; meaning of, 392; distinction from sanctification, 395; meritorious cause of, 397; instrument of, 398; by faith only, 400; works before, 415.
 Justin Martyr, 104, 140, 175, 204, 269, 271, 299, 470, 637, 677.
 KAYE, Bishop, 246, 470.
 Kirkpatrick, Professor, 289.

Knox, A., 661.
 Knox, John, 14, 730.

- LACEY. See *Denny*.
 Lambeth Articles, the, 53, 457, 475.
 Lanfranc, 701.
 Laodicea, Council of, 256.
 Laud, Archbishop, advises Charles I. to prefix declaration to the Articles, 49; on Canon V., 67; on Article XX., 513.
 Leicester, Earl of, 64.
 Leo I., 677.
 Leo III., 223.
 Leo the Armenian, 559.
 Liberius, Pope, 526.
 Liddon, H. P., 113, 117, 123, 125, 130, 144, 480.
 Lightfoot, Bishop, 270, 327, 400, 551, 733.
Locus penitentie, 452; *venice*, 454.
 Logos, doctrine of the, 122.
 Lord's Supper. See *Eucharist*.
 Luckock, Dean, 565.
 Lumby, J. R., 335.
 Luther on the Canon of the New Testament, 272; on the slavery of the will, 385; on justification by faith, 401; on good works, 411; on predestination, 484; on the effect of sacraments, 591.
 MACEDONIUS, heresy of, 207.
 Marcellus of Ancyra, heresy of, 321; creed of, 306.
 Martensen, Bishop, 191.
 Mason, A. J., 604.
 Masses, the sacrifices of; meaning of the phrase, 691; medieval teaching on, 692.
 Matrimony, Holy, 605.
 Maurice, F. D., 292.
 Medd, P. G., 96.
 Mediation of Christ, 152.
 Medieval errors condemned in the Articles, 21.
 Melancthon, 463, 590.
 Melchisedech, 779.
 Melito of Sardis, 255.
 Messianic hope in the Old Testament, 285.
 Micronius, Martin, 23, 161.
 Mill, W. H., 246.
 Milligan, Professor, 189.

- Milman, Dean, 483.
 Ministry, the threefold, 731 *seq.*
 Moberly, Bishop, 663.
 Moehler, 237.
Monarchia, doctrine of the, 115.
 Montague, Bishop, 48, 49, 570, 727.
 Montanism, 205, 449.
 Moral law binding on Christians, 294.
 Mozley, J. B., 352, 478, 671, 693.
 Muratori, 333.
 Muratorian fragment on the Canon, 267.
 Nag's Head fable, the, 749.
 Neal, D., 55.
 Necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man, 5, 380, 641, 702.
 Neo-Cæsarea, Council of, 700, 711.
 Nestorius, heresy of, 136.
 New Testament, Canon of, 261; MSS. of, 261; versions of, 263; catalogues of, 265; citations of, 268; language of Article VI. on, 271.
 Newdigate, Sir R., 63.
 Newman, J. H., 114, 237, 274.
 Nicæa, Council of, 124, 520, 533, 698.
 Nicæa, Second Council of, 533, 559.
 Nicene Creed, original form of, 316; enlarged form of, 318; date and object of the enlargement, 321; possibly sanctioned at Constantinople, 324; not noticed at Ephesus, 324; sanctioned at Chalcedon, 324; additions at Toledo, 215; Latin version of, 327; English translation of, 327.
 Nicholas I., Pope, 224.
 Nicholas III., Pope, 228.
 Norria, Archdeacon, 153, 155, 348.
 Novatianism, 449.
 OATHS, Article on, 788; teaching of Scripture on, 789.
 Old Testament, Canon of the, 252; changes in the Article on, 280; not contrary to the New, 283.
 Ommanney, Preb., 339.
Opus operatum, meaning of the phrase, 612.

- Orders, Holy, 605.
 Ordinal, objections of the Puritans to, 731; objections of the Romanists to, 748; validity of the Anglican, 753.
 Ordination, formula of, 746; objections of the Puritans to, 747; objections of the Romanists to, 753.
 Origen, his use of *Ousia* and *Hypospasis*, 107, 108; on eternal generation, 123; uses the term *Homousios*, 126; on 1 Pet. iii. 18, 171; on the term Canonical, 249; on the Canon of Scripture, 255; on predestination, 471; wrongly quoted for invocation of saints, 564; on worship, 583; on the baptism of infants, 638.
 Original sin, Article on, 357; its object, 358; origin of the phrase, 360; Scriptural teaching on, 362.
 Original righteousness, 364; teaching of the Fathers on, 366.
Ousia, history of the term, 107.
 Oxenham, H. N., 155.
- PALMER, Sir W., 241, 242, 244, 536.
 Papal claims, growth of, 776.
 Papal jurisdiction, evidence of Scripture concerning, 773.
 Papias, 269.
 Paradise, 166.
 Pardons. See *Indulgences*.
 Parker, Archbishop, prepares the Thirty-Eight Articles, 30, 32; suggests clause in Art. XXVIII., 36; change made by him, 120, 160, 198, 259, 378; on the descent into hell, 161; on Art. XXIX., 669; consecration of, 748.
 Particular Redemption, 477, 487.
 Pascal II., 678.
 Paschasius Radbert, 597, 650.
 Paul of Samosata, 127, 769.
 Pearson, Bishop, on the position of the Articles, 39; on the unity of God, 91; on the Trinity, 116; on the Son of God, 121; on the descent into hell, 169, 171, 189; on the Macedonian heresy, 199; on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, 201; on the procession of the Holy Ghost, 211.
 Pelagianism, 360.
 Penance, 604.
 Penitential discipline of the Church, 711.
Perichoresis, doctrine of the, 117.
 Perpetua, acts of, 543.
 Perrone, 237, 659.
 Person, history of the term, 105; explanation of, 112.
 Peter, Gospel of, 176.
 Peter Damien, 652.
 Peter Lombard, 571, 597, 654.
 Philo, 254.
 Philpot, Archdeacon, his explanation of the title of the Articles, 17.
 Photius, 224.
 Pirminius on the Creed, 310.
 Pius IV., Pope, 11, 12.
 Pliny, 594.
 Plumtre, Dean, 171, 180, 436.
 Pneumatomachi, the, 208.
 Polycarp, 270; martyrdom of, 563.
 Praxeas, 106.
 Prayers for the departed not condemned in the Articles, 537.
 Predestination, Article on, 459; based on Scripture, 463; Ecclesiastical theory of, 465; Arminian theory of, 470; Roman teaching on, 471; Calvinistic theory of, 474; Augustinian theory of, 477; how to be understood, 479; Scriptural teaching on, 479.
 Presence of Christ as Man, nature of the, 193.
 Priesthood, origin of, 733.
 Procession of the Holy Ghost, doctrine of the, 209.
 Prophets in the New Testament, 737.
 Prosper, 475.
 Prynne, W., 49.
 Puller, F. W., 777.
 Purgatory, history of the doctrine of, 543; Romish doctrine of, 548; teaching of the Greek Church on, 548; evidence of Scripture on, 548.
 Pusey, E. B., 218, 219, 234, 438.
- RANSOM, Christ's death a, 155.
 Rattram, 642, 650.

- Reccared, 215.
 Reconciliation of God to man, 146.
Redditio Symboli, 300.
Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, 28, 90, 120, 182, 198, 232, 259, 359, 373, 379, 424, 441, 445, 461, 488, 494, 511, 530, 533, 574, 589, 599, 616, 645, 783, 788.
 Regeneration, meaning of the word, 623; Greek words for, 623; blessings of, 624; distinction from conversion, 632.
Regula fidei, 305.
 Relics, adoration of, 557.
 Reprobation, 477.
 Resurrection of Christ, evidence for the, 183.
 Resurrection body, nature of the, 186.
 Resurrection of the flesh, 311.
 Reynolds, Dr., 54.
 Rhabanus Maurus, 597.
 Ridley, Bishop, 642, 674, 719.
 Robertson, A., 779.
 Rogers on the Articles, 616.
 Roman Creed, early, 306.
 Rome, Church of, 506 *seq.*
 Roscellinus, 111.
 Row, Prebendary, 186.
 Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles, 47.
 Royal Supremacy. See *Supremacy*.
 Rufinus on the Creed, 178, 304 *seq.*, 314; on the Canon of Scripture, 249, 256, 265, 275.
- SABELLIANISM, 106, 206.
 Sacraments, Zwinglian views of, 588; teaching of the Article on, 588; Anabaptist view of, 588; Calvinistic view of, 590; number of, 593; history of the word, 594; teaching of the Greek Church on, 598; difference between England and Rome on, 601.
 Sacrifice, Christ's death a, 148.
 Sacrifice of Masses. See *Masses*.
 Salmon, Dr., 778.
Salvus, meaning of the word, 347.
 Sampson, 41.
 Sanctification, meaning of, 393.
 Sanday, Professor, 148, 269, 271, 363, 396, 400, 469.
 Sardica, Council of, 779.
- Scarapsus*, 310.
 Schoolmen, the, 368, 418.
 Session at the right hand of God, meaning of the expression, 192; evidence for, 192.
Sheol, Hebrew conception of, 163.
 Sherlock, Dean, 111.
 Socrates, 177, 324, 518, 699.
 Son, meaning of the term, 122.
 Son of God, eternal generation of, 122 *seq.*; incarnation of, 135 *seq.*; union of two natures in one person, 137; atonement of, 145 *seq.*
 South, Dr., 111.
 Stephen of Autun, 652.
 Subscription to the Articles required by Parliament, 43; required by Convocation, 57; form of, modified, 68; not required from the laity, 64; history of, at the universities, 64.
 Substance, history of the term, 107.
 Supererogation, works of, Article on, 424; history of the word, 425.
 Supremacy, Royal, history of, 761 *seq.*; meaning of, 765 *seq.*
 Swainson, Professor, 335.
 Swete, Professor, 104, 177, 205, 208, 213, 310 *seq.*
Symbolum, meaning of the term, 304.
- TARASIVS, Patriarch of Constantinople, 221.
 Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 242.
 Ten Articles of 1536, the, 3.
 Tertullian, 105, 107, 108, 140, 166, 176, 213, 241, 248, 269, 275, 298, 303, 311, 453, 455, 543, 555, 557, 595, 638, 785.
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 216, 225.
 Theodore of Tarsus, 220.
 Theodoret, 216, 324.
 Theodotus, 105.
 Theophilus of Antioch, 105, 204, 366.
Theotocos, title of, 136.
Thesaurus ecclesie, 434.
 Thirlwall, Bishop, 659.
 Thirteen Articles of 1538, 7.
 Thirty-Eight Articles of 1563, history of the, 30; compared with the Forty-Two Articles, 38;

- indebted to the Confession of
Württemberg, 38; submitted to
Convocation, 30; changes intro-
duced by the Queen, 31.
- Thirty-Nine Articles, revision of
1571, 42; their true character,
38, 52; Latin and English both
authoritative, 46; Royal declara-
tion prefixed to, 50; Puritan
objections to, 51 *seq.*; subscrip-
tion to. See *Subscription*.
- Toledo, third Council of, 215.
- Traditio Symboli*, 300.
- Tradition and Scripture, 236 *seq.*
- Traditions, Article on, 717. Cf. 514
seq.
- Transubstantiation, history of the
doctrine, 649; meaning of the
word, 653; how far accepted by
the Greeks, 653; why condemned,
656.
- Trench, Archbishop, 418.
- Trent, Council of, 10; on the
authority of Scripture, 235; on
the Canon of the Old Testament,
252; on original sin, 375; on
justification, 394, 405; on good
works, 411; on predestination,
487; on purgatory, 538; on
pardons, 539; on adoration of
images and relics, 540; on in-
vocation of saints, 541; on the
use of Latin in the Mass, 584; on
sacraments, 598; on the sacrifice
of the Mass, 693; on Extreme
Unction, 608; on grace *ex opere
operato*, 612; on transubstantia-
tion, 655; on the Eucharist, 664,
674; on concomitance, 680; on
clerical celibacy, 704.
- Trinity, the Holy, preparation for
the doctrine in the Old Testa-
ment, 93; revelation of, in the
New Testament, 98; the doctrine
agreeable to reason, 101; first
occurrence of the word, 104;
meaning of the doctrine, 114;
priority of order in the, 116.
- Trullo, Council in, 699.
- UNCTION of the sick, history of
605. See also *Extreme Unction*.
- Unction, gift of, 142.
- Usher, Archbishop, 333, 567.
- Utrecht Psalter, the, 334.
- VARIATIONS in Church Services, 719.
- Vasquez, 685, 692.
- Vatican Council, the, 773.
- Vaughan, Dean, 134, 204.
- Venantius Fortunatus, 178, 334.
- Victor, Pope, 778.
- Vincent of Lerins, 242, 343.
- Virgin, Christ born of a, 140;
immaculate conception of the
440.
- WAKEMAN, H. O., 764, 771.
- War, lawfulness of, 781.
- Waterland, D., on the Articles,
46; on subscription, 62; vindica-
tion of the doctrine of the Trinity,
111; on the Athanasian Creed,
331 *seq.*; on good works, 413
seq.; on blasphemy against the
Holy Ghost, 448.
- Watson, Bishop, 676.
- Westcott, Bishop, 97, 117, 122, 130,
134, 156, 169, 181, 185, 186, 188,
191, 211, 250, 256, 258, 302, 450
seq., 558, 676.
- Westminster Assembly of Divines,
55, 376.
- Westminster Confession, the, 369.
- Westminster, Council of, 701.
- Whitaker, Professor, 54.
- Whitgift, Archbishop, three Articles
of, 58; subscription to them
required by the Canons of 1604,
59.
- William of Occam, 526.
- Winchester, Council of, 701.
- Wiseman, Cardinal, 237.
- Witmund, 673.
- Woolton, 422.
- Württemberg, Confession of. See
Confession.
- ZOSIMUS, Pope, 507, 779.